

A
DISCOURSE
Concerning the
IMPUTATION
OF
CHRIST'S Righteousness
To US, and OUR
S I N S
To H I M;

With many useful QUESTIONS,
thereunto pertaining, Resolved.

Together with Reflections more at large upon what
hath been published concerning that Subject by Mr. Robert
Ferguson in his *Interest of Reason in Religion*; and
by Dr. *John Owen* in his Book styled *Communion with
God*.

By *Thomas Hotchkiss* Rector of *Stanton* by
Highbworth in the County of *Wilts*.

Remissio peccatorum est justitia imputata. Cham. Tom.
3. l. 21. c. 19.

Idem sunt Remissio peccatorum & Justificatio. Urs. Cat. Q 60.

L O N D O N,

Printed for *Walter Kestilby* at the *Bishops-Head*, in
St. Paul's Church-yard. MDC LXXV.

A

LIBRARY OF THE
TOWN OF NEWTON
STATIONERY.

THE CHILDREN OF
EDWIN F. HATFIELD



THE
EPISTLE
TO THE
READER.

Courteous Reader,



THE Scope of this Treatise is to demonstrate Christ's Righteousness to be in no other Sence imputed to Believers, than were their Sins to him; that is, as their Sin it self, or in it's formal nature, was not imputed to Christ, but only in the deserved punishment thereof, so neither is Christ's Righteousness imputed to them otherwise than in it's blessed fruits and saving effects: So that Sinners being justified by Christ's Obedience, or made righteous (as St. Paul expresseth it) is no more than their being disobliged and acquitted from Condemnation for the merit of Christ's Righteousness.

The occasion of my Undertaking this Service, was, the perusing some late Books, concerning whose Authors

The Epistle to the Reader.

thors, though I must bear them record, that they have a zeal of God, yet I cannot say, as gladly I would, that it is according to knowledg. The Doctrine maintained in this Treatise is by one of the said Authors Mr. Rolls accused as damnable doctrine, as a limb of Popery, yea the very Rats-bane of Popery, and the maintenance of it an expresse contradiction of the Church of England in the great point of Justification: By which words, and many others to the same purpose, he hath done more credit to the Church of Rome, and more wrong and dishonour to our own Church, than I believe he did intend, or was aware of. Another of those Authors Dr. Owen in his Vindication against Mr. Sherlock hath very much of the same uncharitable and unadvised talk. And after the perusal of these, Mr. Ferguson's Book, styled the Interest of Reason in Religion came to my hands, wherein I perceived the like fervent and inordinate Zeal: Hereupon, as the Apostle saith of the good Zeal of his Corinthians, that it had provoked very many, the Zeal of these Brethren for the upholding and propagating Error hath in a different Sence provoked me, viz. to offer an helping hand for the defence of the truth, nor hath ought else induced me hereunto; as having not the least Pique at any of those Authors persons, in regard of their dissent from my sentiments, or on any other account, they being all perfectly unknown to me, nor the least touch of envy at their Popularity, nor was I excited to this undertaking by any other.

If any shall object against my thus voluntarily appearing in this Contest, as Eliab did against his brother David's

The Epistle to the Reader.

David's forwardness to another kind of Combate, saying, it is the pride and naughtiness of thy heart, I think it enough to reply as David did, Is there not a Cause? Seeing so many at this time employ to the utmost their Pens and Tongues to decry and defame the great Truths here contended for, and to defend and promote the erroneous Principles here opposed.

As for my manner of writing, I was solicitous only to speak intelligibly to the capacity of ordinary Readers, not affecting curiosity of the Stile: And, I hope, it will appear that I have endeavoured to right the Truths of the Gospel without wronging any of my dissenting Brethren, by misrepresenting their words or sense or uncomely reflections upon any of them: I think it expedient likewise to declare, that in this Controversy concerning imputed Righteousness, I do not step forth as a second to any, who have of late appeared for the Cause I maintain, either particularly Mr. R. Baxter, Mr. William Sherlock, Mr. Joseph Truman, Mr. Edward Fowler, or any other. My only aim was, according to my slender Talent, to serve and bear witness to the truth, without design to please or gratify any person.

If after this Profession of an honest meaning and sincere desire to do good, it shall prove my Lot to hear ill in any kind, to be accused as a ~~magistrus~~, or Prevaricator, one who would build again what by his Subscription to the Articles and Homilies of the Church of England he hath destroyed, to be reprobated as a Socinian, or to suffer by any other name of intended Ignominy, I shall not thereupon be so surprized, as if some strange thing had happened to me, nor shall I in

The Epistle to the Reader.

the least (I hope through God's grace) be discouraged by such usage, nor yet exasperated, but shall say in the words of the Prophet Jeremy, Truly this is a grief and I must bear it.

Lastly, I think it not amiss to add this Information, that the following Treatise is only one Part of what I designed to publish concerning imputed Righteousness, and that I have almost perfected a second part concerning Forgiveness of Sin, as that very Righteousness which is said in Scripture to be imputed by God to believing Sinners, for the sake of Christ's Righteousness; and withal concerning Faith, as the thing it self, which is most expressly and very frequently said in Scripture to be imputed for Righteousness; with the resolution of many material Questions pertaining thereunto. I desired to have had both these parts published together, but this having been a great while in the Press, it was thought more advisable, that it should not stay for the other, but come out by it self.

To conclude, Let us be zealously affected alwaies, Gal. 4. 18. but with the great St. Paul's Limitation in a good thing, and according to the weight of every such matter, let the height of our Zeal be; and above 1 Pet. 4. 8. all things let us have fervent Charity among our selves: May the God of Peace, and Love, and Truth be with us all, This shall be ever the heart's desire and prayer of

Stanton.
July 26. 1675.

Reader,

Thy aged Servant in the
Work of the Gospel,

Thomas Hotchkis.

THE CONTENTS.

CHAP. i. Q. *Is the Righteousness of Jesus Christ imputed to Believers?* *Answ.* *Although it be yielded, that in Rom. 5. 18. there is express mention of the word [Righteousness] undeniably to be understood of the Righteousness of Christ, nevertheless neither in that Scripture, nor in any other place, is Christs Righteousness expressly said to be imputed to Believers.* pag. 1.

Chap. ii. Q. *Have all our Protestant Preachers and Writers erred from the Truth of Scripture, who have spoken of Christs Righteousness under the name, or notion of a Righteousness imputed, or have asserted the Imputation of Christs Righteousness to us.* *Answ.* *No, God forbid, two reasons of which answer are rendred.* p. 3.

Chap. iii. Q. *In what sence is it true, or false, to say, That Christs Righteousness is imputed to us?* *In answer hereunto a twofold acceptation of the word [Righteousness] is specified, respectively to which different acceptation of the word, it is determined in what sence the Imputation of Christs Righteousness to us, is to be asserted, and in what sence it is to be renounced, with certain Reasons of the abrenunciation thereof.* p. 4.

Chap. iv. *An Objection from 2 Cor. 5. 21. answered and also retorted. The blasphemy of Mr. William Eyre in his Affize-Sermon preached at Sarum, 1652. reprov'd* p. 10.

Chap. v. Q. *Did Christ take upon him the Guilt as well as the Punishment of our Sins?* *Answ.* *No. A brief explication of the Distinction of Guilt, commonly stiled Guilt of Fault, and Guilt of Punishment, together with a Reply to what is alledg'd by certain late Writers out of Bishop Andrews.* p. 13.

Chap. vi. *An Answer to several unjustifiable passages in Mr. Ferguson's Fork, stiled [The Interest of Reason in Religion —]. His false and manifold uncharitable insinuations, answer'd. Wherein 'tis shew'd what manner*

The Contents.

of guilt or obligation to punishment that was, which Christ took upon him. That Christ did not suffer, however by occasion of that Law (Gen 2.17.) as transgressed, yet not by vertue thereof, as if that Law in, or by his sufferings had been executed. His mistake of the true nature of Gospel justification, demonstrated. That it is not against the essential Holiness of God (as Mr. Ferguson pretends) to justify a sinner upon an obedience (Ex parte sui, seu peccatoris) imperfect, with the reason of his mistake. p. 16.

Chap.vii. That the Scripture doth no where assert a surrogation of Christ in our room, in such a strict Law-sence, as that we may be said in, and by, him to have done and suffered what he did and suffered, and in or by him to have redeemed our selves. And that Christ did not in such a Law-sence, represent us as Proctors and Attorneys do their Clients, Ambassadors their Princes, or Guardians their Pupils, acting accordingly in our names, but officiating as a Mediator betwixt God and Man. The evil Consequences charged by Mr.F. upon the contrary Doctrine, are denied. His thrashing Contradiction imputed to others, avoided by them, & retorted upon himself. p.25.

Chap.viii. Mr. Ferguson's mistake in thinking, that a sinner by his justification is freed from the guilt of punishment and fault too. That Christ's righteousness is not more, or otherwise imputed to us for, in, towards, or in order to, our justification, than the remission of our sin. The nature of justification [forensic] opened, both of justification indefinitely considered, as also of Gospel-justification in special. The truth of the matter laid down in several Propositions. p.28.

Chap.ix. That those who assert, That the Law of works is abrogated, do in substance of truth accord with those, who choose rather to express themselves saying, It is relaxed or dispensed with. God in justifying a sinner doth not pronounce him just and righteous, that is, no sinner. A sinner not otherwise made just and righteous by his being justified,

The Contents.

justified, than by his being pardoned through Christ. That a sinner cannot possibly be justified from the accusation of the Law, in it's charging him to be a sinner. p.36.

Chap.x. That the difference betwixt remission and Gospel-justification is not at all in this, viz. That remission is the result of mercy, and the act of one exercising favour, and justification the off-spring of Justice, as Mr.F.says. The usage of words in common speech, sometimes in signification contrary to that of Scripture, exemplified in the language of our Brethren of Scotland. Mr.Ferguson's notorious mistake in asserting, That to justify is no where in the Scripture-usurpation equipollent with to forgive. p.39.

Chap.xi. Mr. Ferguson's mistake in saying, That we are made Righteous With the Righteousness of Christ, as also Dr.Owen's in his Book styled (Communion with the Trinity) refuted, and that in Rom.5. 18. alledged by him, answered, wherein is declared, That it is one thing to be justified By, and another thing to be justified With the Righteousness of Christ. The Doctor's misinterpretation of Phil.3.9.and Eph.2.8. That the asserting of the whole of Justification, to consist in remission of sin, hath no such evil consequences, as Mr.F.chargeth it with. p.42.

Chap.xii. Q.Is a sinner said in a proper or improper sence to be justified? In answer hereunto it is declared, 1. That the Question in it self is immaterial. 2. Nevertheless for the satisfaction of Mr.F.the Question is answered, and therein it's proved, That the Justification of a sinner is of, or in it's kind a proper Justification, and in what respects so said to be, specified. An Objection answered. p.48.

Chap.xiii. Q.Why, or for what reasons, may pardon of sin be called Justification, and Vice versa? Or, What reasons are there for their promiscuous use in the N.T? Answ.In answer whereunto, 1.It is acknowledged, That the Question is in it self not so considerable. 2. Nevertheless for the satisfaction of many dissenting Brethren, in answer thereunto, several reasons of the thing are assigned and specified. p.54.

Chap.

The Contents.

- Chap. xiv. *Q. How is the justification of a sinner to be denominated, whether Evangelical or Legal? Answ. Rather Evangelical, and the reason assigned. The Arguments of those on the contrary side both answered and retorted, who acknowledg, that the justification of a sinner is Evangelical ex parte principii, but would not have it absolutely to be so styled, but rather a Legal justification. The reason why this Question is debated and answered. p. 58.*
- Chap. xv. *Several mistakes in Mr. F. according to the obvious construction of his words, detected. That Christ suffered not the Idem, but the Tantundem, manifested by three things, distinctly specified, and two evil consequences of the contrary Doctrine. With a Caution in the close. p. 63.*
- Chap. xvi. *The Imputation of Socinianism groundlessly charged by Mr. F. upon his Brethren. Mr. F. his charging his Antagonists with non-sence, refuted. That sort of union with Christ to be renounced, the native consequence whereof is the reciprocal Imputation of our sins to Christ, and of his Righteousness to us, in the sence of Mr. F. with his Adherents (i.e.) properly and formally, or otherwise than in the fruits and effects of the one, and of the other. The reason thereof rendered. p. 69.*
- Chap. xvii. *That Christ may very well be said to be made sin for us, to bear our sins, to dye for our offences — although it cannot be truly said, that he did bear our sin it self, or sin in it self, or otherwise than in the fruit and effects of it, the contrary whereunto is pretended by Mr. F. Mr. Ferguson's mistake in confounding an Antecedent impulsive Cause, with a meritorious Cause, the difference whereof is asserted and exemplified. His mistake in not distinguishing betwixt An Obligation and Our Obligation to suffer. That though our sins did properly merit Christ's suffering, nevertheless it will not follow from thence, that Christ himself did merit it, or rock upon him the meriting thereof. That Christ may be said in an improper sence to be punished. The word*
— [Demerit

The Contents.

- [Demerit of Punishment] *ambiguous, a two-fold sence whereof is specified. The Arguments which overthrow the Popish doctrine of believers, being discharged from the guilt of sin, but not the Punishment, altogether mis-applied by Mr.F. to the point in hand. p.73.*
- Chap.xviii. *Reflections upon certain passages in Dr.J.Owen's Book styled (Communion with God) concerning Christ his being made ruddy in his own blood, Morally by the Imputation of sin; and concerning that blessed Bartering and Exchange pretended by him, betwixt Believers giving up their sins to Christ, and their taking from him that Righteousness, which he wrought for them. His obscure, ambiguous, un-Scriptural phrases reproved, and his mistakes therein (according to obvious construction) detected. An Objection answered, wherein a two-fold Taking or Receiving of a thing is specified, and applied to the purpose in hand. His mistake in affirming, that the Saints by giving up their sins to Christ, and taking from him his Righteousness, do fulfil the whole of that in 2 Cor.5.21. The falshood of the reason asserted by the Doctor, why those, who said, Lord, Lord, were disappointed in their expectation, instead whereof, the true reason or reasons are assigned. That for sinners to plead their repentance and duties, is not to barter with themselves only, to take Christs work out of his hand, and to ascribe it to other things, or to say their duties shall bear their iniquities (according as the Dr. misconstrues the matter) but it is in very deed and in true construction, to put the work of their being actually saved, into the hand of Christ, and to keep it there. The manner of a sinners Bartering with Christ laid open, if it may fitly be so styled. p.81,82.*
- Chap.xix. *In what sence may it be truly said, That we are interested in Christs Merit or Satisfaction. In answer hereunto it is said, That three things may possibly be meant, by the Merit or Satisfaction of Christ, which being*

The Contents.

ing distinctly specified, the Question is accordingly determined. p. 98.

Chap.xx. *Q. To what profit would the Righteousness of Christ in it self, imputed to the justification of a sinner, be more than the Imputation of it in the benefit thereof? Answ. None at all, except that be a benefit, which the Familists do pretend unto, and which they call Our being Christed with Christ. The suffrage of the very learned Dr. Henry More. An Objection answered, taken from the pretence of several benefits, which being distinctly specified in the following Chapters, are there manifested to be null and void. p. 102.*

Chap.xxi. *One benefit pretended by divers, That by Remission of sin, a sinner is freed from the punishment deserved by his faults, but by Christs Righteousness imputed, he is freed from the fault it self, the vanity of which pretence is discovered. Several Objections answered, wherein is shewen, That a sinner may be disobliged from suffering the punishment deserved for his faults, and yet remain faulty still; and that it is repugnant to the nature, as well as to the Law of God, for God to repute a sinner to be that, which he is not, or not to have committed those faults, which he hath committed. That it is one thing for God to repute a person to be innocent, and quite another to be dealt with respectively to impunity as innocent. In what sence a Thief having made satisfaction for his theft, is in the sence of the Law a Thief still. The main ground of mistake in this matter specified. p. 105.*

Chap.xxii. *Another benefit pretended to be had by Justification, through Christs Righteousness imputed, over and above the pardon of our sins is, That remission of sin doth take off a sinners obligation to punishment, but Justification by Christs Righteousness imputed, doth put him into a state of favour and acceptation with God, the vanity of which pretence is discovered. The definition of Justification, given by the late Assembly of Divines, in their lesser*

The Contents.

lesser Catechism explicated, so as to reconcile it with the truth of Scripture, though not from tautology. Three main grounds of the mistake, in the difference here pretended, to be betwixt remission of sin, and justification by the Imputation of Christs Righteousness. p.114.

Chap.xxiii. A third benefit pretended by a sinners justification, through Christs imputed Righteousness, over and above remission of sin, is, That this latter doth only free the sinner from eternal death, but justification doth moreover intitle him to eternal life, the vanity of which pretence is discovered; with an answer to what is objected to the contrary by Mr.Anth.Burges. An Answer also to the Question, Whether believing sinners are not restored by Christ, unto a greater degree of felicity, by their justification through Christs Righteousness (supposing the Imputation of it) than upon the bare score of the forgiveness of their sins? The Contradictions of Mr.Anth.Burges, in certain particulars instanc'd in. p.118.

Chap.xxiv. Q.What are the evil Consequents, which do naturally flow from the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, in the sence here impugned? In answer hereunto, one mischievous consequence is specified, viz. That Christ is a sinner, and the greatest of sinners. p.129.

Chap.xxv. Another evil Consequence of the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, in the sence disowned, viz. That Believers are as perfectly Righteous, as is Christ The Righteous, yea, that they are more Righteous, than if they had in their own persons perfectly kept the whole Law, and that they are as acceptable to God the Father, as is Christ himself. The falshood and impiety of which sayings at large manifested, and some Scriptures which are suborned to speak against the truth, vindicated. That man may be said to be justified by the Righteousness of another, and not by his own, three ways, in the Application of which distinction it is plainly declared, in what sence we are, and in what sence we are not justified by the Righteousness of another,

The Contents.

- nother, and not by our own. Several unjustifiable and intolerable sayings of Dr. Owen, in his Book styled, *Communion with God, related, with brotherly and necessary animadversions thereupon.* p.133.
- Chap. xxvi. Another evil Consequence of the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, in the sence opposed, That God sees no sin in the Saints, all their sins being covered from the sight of God, by their being clothed with the Righteousness of Christ; the falsity of which is discovered, and certain Scriptures vindicated from their abuse. A reply to Dr. Owen, who denies, That it will follow from the said Imputation of Christs Righteousness to us, that we are as perfectly righteous as Christ is. p.147.
- Chap. xxvii. Another evil Consequence of the said Imputation, That it leaves no place for remission of sin, in persons made so compleatly righteous, with Christs Righteousness, and that it doth utterly overthrow the nature of Gospel-Justification, making the justification of a sinner to be quite another thing, and of another kind, than indeed it is. An Objection answered. p.152.
- Chap. xxviii. Another evil consequence of the said Imputation, That it subverts the necessity of our repentance, in order to our salvation by Christ, that the non-necessity thereof in Believers, hath been asserted by some. p.155.
- Chap. xxix. Another evil Consequence of the said Imputation, That it overthrows the necessity of new obedience, in order to a sinners being saved by Christ; Whence it is, that divers Authors, whereof some are named, do assert, That Christians are not to do any good duties, that they may be saved. Several passages to this purpose in Dr. Owen's Book styled (*Communion with God*) related, with Animadversions thereupon more at large. p.157.
- Chap. xxx. Q. May Believers be truly or fitly said to be clothed with the Robe of Christs Righteousness, or the like form of words? Four Reasons why the said Question is proposed and answered. The Answer it self. 1. That there
are

The Contents.

are no such expresse sayings in Scripture, nor any Scripture wherein Christs Righteousness is set forth under the Metaphor of Rayment. 2. That our own personal Righteousness, in the several branches thereof, doth go under the Metaphorical expressions of Robes, comely rayments, and splendid array. Several Scriptures, objected to the contrary, answered. In what sence 'tis true, and in what, false, to say, that we are clothed with the Robe of Christs Righteousness: And that it is more fitly and intelligibly said, that it purchaseth or procureth Clothing for us, than that it is it self our Clothing. p. 175.

Chap. xxxi. Dr. Owen's mistake in thinking, That when all sin is answered for, all the Righteousness, which God requireth for that time, is not fulfilled; the contrary whereunto is proved. Several other of his mistakes discovered, and his mis-interpretations of several Scriptures. p. 184.

Chap. xxxii. That it is no where said in Scripture, that we do receive the Righteousness of Christ. The Doctor's perverting that in Phil. 3. 9. from the true meaning of the Apostle. That he perverts the sence of 1 Cor. 1. 30. utterly beside the meaning of the Apostle. That he mistakes the sence of Rom. 5. 10. That Christ hath done no more by the obedience of his life for a sinners salvation, than for his reconciliation, the contrary whereunto is supposed by Dr. O. His iterated mistake touching the end of Adam's obedience. p. 189.

Chap. xxxiii. The Doctor's allegation of several Scriptures to no purpose. That we are no otherwise justified, than we are reconciled, or pardoned through the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, the contrary whereunto is pretended by Dr. O. That none of those Scriptures alledged by him, to prove the Imputation of Christs obedience it self unto us, do evince the same. His error in attributing our justification to the life of Christ, whereas the Apostle doth (Rom. 5. 9.) expressly attribute it to his Death, however it is not to be understood, as excluding the obedience of his Life. p. 194.

Chap.

The Contents.

Chap. xxxiv. Dr. Owen's mis-interpretation of Zech. 3. 3, 4. That remission of sin is no more the proper fruit of Christ's death (as the Doctor would have it) than is Justification. That there is not required a collation of Righteousness, over and above remission of sin (as he asserts) in order to a right to Heaven. His allegation of Esa. 61. 10. to no purpose. p. 198.

Chap. xxxv. That our deliverance from a state of rejection, or un-acceptation, and our Acceptation with God, are not two things, and to be ascribed to two several causes, as the Dr. pretends. That in 2 Cor. 5. 21. mis-alleged by him for his purpose, retorted to the purpose against him. — His unreasonableness in supposing, the old quarrel betwixt God and us to be taken away, and yet no new friendship contracted. His senseless contradiction in supposing, That Adam was guilty of no sin, and yet not to have had thereupon a positive as well as a negative Holiness. That the non-imputation of sin, and the imputation of righteousness, are not two things, but one and the same thing. That Christ's Righteousness is not our righteousness before God, otherwise than in a causal sense, and that our Righteousness it self before God is our own personal righteousness. That in Rom. 5. 18. vainly alleged by the Dr. to prove his purpose. That the non-imputation of sin, and the Imputation of Righteousness (as they are the same thing) so they are to be ascribed to one and the same cause. p. 203.

Chap. xxxvi. The difference betwixt Dr. Owen and Mr. Ferguson in their opinion, concerning the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, or Obedience unto us, plainly laid open in their own words, recited. That the Doctor denies Christ's death to have been in our stead, but only as it was penal. The Author's opinion plainly and expressly declared, in opposition to the Doctor's. That satisfaction was no otherwise the effect of Christ's death as a penalty, than as a price, and as a sacrifice. p. 208.



OF THE
IMPUTATION
OF
Christs Righteousness, &c.

CHAP. I.

Q. *Is the Righteousness of Jesus Christ imputed to Believers?* Answ. *Although it be yielded, that in Rom. 5. 18. there is express mention of the word [Righteousness] undeniably to be understood of the Righteousness of Christ, nevertheless neither in that Scripture, nor in any other place is Christs Righteousness expressly said to be imputed to Believers.*

Q. 1. *Is the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us, (i.e.) to believing sinners?*



Answ. That the Righteousness of Christ is imputed to believers, is an assertion no where in terms to be found

found in Scripture. And whereas by the Righteousness of one, or that one Righteousness mentioned *Rom. 5. 18.* is unquestionably meant the Righteousness of Christ, expressed by name in the foregoing verse: Yet this Righteousness of Christ is not there, or in any other place of Scripture (for ought I know) expressly said to be imputed to us: and forasmuch as the Scriptures are so silent therein, I cannot but wonder, that any one should affirm, that the sound of the Imputation of Christs Righteousness is in the Scriptures as shrill, or loud as was that of the Trumpet at Mount *Sinai*, as if the sound thereof had gone forth ten times out of the mouth of the Apostle in that one Chapter, *Rom. 4.* whereas the truth is, that although there be frequent mention in that Chapter of the words [Righteousness and Imputed] nevertheless as to the *Imputation* of *Christs* Righteousness there is *Altum silentium*, a deep silence, it being neither in that, nor in any other Chapter of the Bible expressly asserted, that Christs Righteousness is imputed to us.

I will conclude this short Chapter with the suffrage of *Parens de justitia Christi Acti. & Pass. Nunquam legi, humanam sanctitatem Christi nobis imputatam esse justitiam nostram, vel ejus partem. Si quis legit, queso mihi ostendat, ut & ego legam, & credam.* In this sort must I needs say of the Righteousness of Christ, whether Active, or Passive, or both, or without any distinction, that I never found it expressly said to be imputed to us, or to be ours by imputation or any part of our righteousness. If any man hath any where in the Bible read such sayings, I beseech him to direct me to the Repositories (Chapter and Verse) where they are to be found, that having read them, I may at once believe both my own eyes and his.

C H A P. II.

Q. Have all our Protestant Preachers and Writers erred from the truth of Scripture, who have spoken of Christs Righteousness under the name, or notion of a Righteousness imputed, or have asserted the Imputation of Christs Righteousness to us. Answ. No, God forbid, two reasons of which answer are rendered.

*Q. 2. F*Orasmuch as it hath been very ordinary with our Protestant Divines both in their Sermons and Writings (both in polemical and positive Divinity) to say, That Christs Righteousness is imputed to us, and imputed to us for righteousness, have all of them erred from the truth in so saying?

Answ. No, God forbid: for although none of them have precisely kept to the form of wholsome words, but swerved or varied rather from the language of Scripture in that saying, nevertheless there is no necessity to conclude them all to be under error upon that account: for 1. A man may possibly, yea, we do very ordinarily speak the truth of Scripture, although not in the words, or terms of Scripture. An assertion may be a Scriptural truth, though it be not formed, or asserted in Scripture-words, and phrase.

2. There are several senses of the word [*Righteousness*] respectively whereunto it is as well true, as false, to say, That Christs Righteousness is imputed to us; and this I will endeavour to explicate, in answer to the following Question, which will be the subject of the next Chapter.

C H A P. III.

Q. In what sense is it true, or false, to say, That *Christs Righteousness* is imputed to us? In answer hereunto a twofold acceptation of the word [*Righteousness*] is specified, respectively to which different acceptation of the word, it is determined in what sense the Imputation of *Christs Righteousness* to us, is to be asserted, and in what sense it is to be renounced, with certain Reasons of the abrenunciation thereof.

Q. 3. **W**Hat are those divers acceptations of the word [*Righteousness*] with respect whereunto the Imputation of *Christs Righteousness* to us may be asserted as a truth, or is to be rejected as an Error?

Ansiv. The word [*Righteousness*] is taken in a double sense, viz. properly, or figuratively: 1. It is taken in Scripture sometimes, yea very often, improperly, or figuratively, not for the thing it self, but for the issue, or benefit thereof. This kind of Trope is usual in Scripture and in common speech, it being ordinary with us to put the name of a thing in the propriety of it instead of its return in the blessed issue, fruits, or products thereof. In this sense the word is taken *Job* 33. 26. where *Elihu* says, That God will render to a man his righteousness (i.e.) not the thing it self, but the fruit and comfort of it. In this sense those, who fear God, are said to eat the labour of their hands (i.e.) that emolument, which with their hands they did labour for, *Pf.* 28. 2. In the like sense he who planted a Vineyard, is said to

to eat, or not to eat of it (*i.e.*) of the fruit of it. *Dent.* 20. 6. Thus *work* is put for the *reward* of it, *Rev.* 14. 13. *Job* 34. 11. *The work of a man will he render unto him.* Thus *Ephes.* 6. 8. *Whatsoever good thing any man doth, the same shall he receive of the Lord* (*i.e.*) not the self same thing, that is done, but the same in the fruit and reward of it. In the like sense are those words of *St. John* to be understood, wherein he admonishes the Elect Lady, and her Children to beware, *That they lose not the things which they had wrought* (*i.e.*) the *reward* of the things wrought by them. Now in this sense it is true to say, and a truth worthy of all acceptation, That Christs Righteousness is imputed to us, that is, in the saving effects of it, or blessings procured by it. In this sense to say, That Christs Righteousness is imputed to us, is the self same thing as to say, That the fruit and benefit procured by his Righteousness is confer'd upon us. And this, I doubt not, is the meaning of the Apostle in those his sayings, *Rom.* 5. 18, 19. That by Christs Righteousness the free gift (of pardon, or justification) comes to us, and That by his obedience we (the *many*), the many there mentioned) are made righteous (*i.e.*) we for the sake of his righteousness, or obedience, are constituted righteous (*i.e.*) pardoned, or justified. And be it observed, That as [*Righteousness*] so *sin* also in the same figurative sense is said to be imputed to a sinner (*i.e.*) in the deserved fruits and effects of it: When the deserved punishment thereof is, or is not inflicted upon a sinner, then is his sin said to be imputed, or not imputed to him. In this sense those words of *Shimei* supplicating his Sovereign for pardon, are to be understood, he saying, *Let not my Lord impute iniquity unto me*, 2 *Sam.* 19. 19. Where by iniquity he doth not mean the thing it self in a

proper sense, *Ipsam culpam*, the sinful action, or the act of sinning, but the deserved fruit and punishment of it: In this sense the word sin, or iniquity, are very oftentimes taken in Scripture, as in *Gen.* 4. 13. and *19.* 15. *Luke* 7. 18.

And as touching the word [impute] when applyed to what is in it self good, or desirable, be it observed, That it is the manner of Scripture sometimes to express the collation of a benefit upon us, or derivation thereof unto us by the word [impute] whether the benefit it self accrues to us by the way of debt, or free donation, as appears *Rom.* 4. 4. *To him, that worketh, the reward is reckoned*, or imputed (for so the word is rendred three times in the same Chapter, v. 22, 23, 24.) *not of grace, but of debt (i. e.)* on such a one it is confer'd not of grace, but of debt, and so to be reputed. In this sense to say Christs Righteousness is imputed to us, is all one as to say, Christs Righteousness is in the saving fruit and benefit thereof confer'd upon us; and he, who says so, speaks the very truth of Scripture. Having declared in what sense the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ may and ought to be asserted and maintained, I shall in the next place specify the sense, wherein it is to be rejected, in order whereunto let it be observed, that

2. The word [*Righteousness*] is sometimes taken properly and formally for the very thing it self in its essential nature, in which sense, as it is very oftentimes taken, when applyed to the righteousness of man, *Prov.* 10. 2, 12, 28. *Alis* 10. 35. *Rom.* 6. 13, 18, 20. so likewise to the Righteousness of Christ, *Rom.* 5. 18. where the Righteousness of Christ is expressly mentioned. And be it observed, That as Righteousness in the former sense may not unfitly (as I think) be styled a Passive, and in the latter an Active Righteousness,

ness, so the said two different senses of the word [Righteousness] do differ as *Officium & Beneficium*, the one being the receiving of some good, or benefit confer'd on us, the other the doing of some good, or duty performed by us. The phrase [receiving righteousness] see in *Psal. 24. 5. He shall receive the blessing from the Lord, and Righteousness from the God of his Salvation*: Righteousness in that place being the self same thing with Gods blessing, his saving blessing. The phrase [doing righteousness] see in *1 Job. 3. 7. He, that doth righteousness, is righteous*. As this is stiled a *sowing of righteousness*, *Prov. 11. 28.* so that may very fitly and suitably to the language of Scripture both of the Old and New Testament be stiled *Reaping Righteousness*, *Hos. 10. 12. Gal. 6. 7, 8, 9.* Now in this proper, formal sense of the word [Righteousness] the Imputation of Christs Righteousness to us is a doctrine, however owned by too too many, yet by very many others of our own and forraign Protestant Churches justly disowned as that, which is no where to be found in Scripture, whether in the words, or meaning of any Text in Scripture: for to assert, that Christs Righteousness is in this sense imputed to us, is to assert, That God doth account or reckon, that the Righteousness which Christ wrought, we wrought in and by him, or that we are reputed by God to have fulfilled the Law, and satisfied Divine Justice in and by Christ, that what Christ did in his own natural Person, God doth account, we did in and by him: for, to have any thing imputed to a man in the propriety, formality, or essential nature of the thing, is to be reputed the doer of what is so imputed to him, these being terms equivalent and explicatory one of another; and as thus explicated do the Brethren, whom I do take upon me in this point to oppose, openly own the

They differ as work, and wages, as Duty and Mercy.

16

said doctrine touching the Imputation of Christs Righteousness to us; it being their error to think; that Christs Righteousness cannot be accepted by God in our behoof, or prove savingly beneficial to us, unless it be imputed to us in their said sense; or to imagine (as they do) a necessity, that what is imputed to, or for the justification of a sinner, should be reputed to be done by him, who is justified; for it sufficeth to imputation in this case, if that which is done, be accepted of God in the behalf of sinners, or instead of that, which a justified person should in his own person have performed. Nor is there any cause, or colour for them to suspect, that the denial of the said Imputation in their said sense doth infer, or include a denial of Christs satisfaction, whether in the thing it self, or in the blessed effects of it. I am at once both sorry, and I wonder to read such passages as these in some learned Authors, they saying to this purpose, *viz. That human reason, or mans understanding cannot comprehend, how Christs satisfaction can be of saving benefit to us, unless it be imputed to us in its formal and essential nature*: The contrary whereunto is as obvious to be conceived by any unprejudicate person, as obvious almost can be. For my own part I do humbly conceive it to be a great and dangerous mistake to think, that Christ satisfied Divine Justice for believing sinners, that they might be reputed by God to have satisfied in and by him as their surety; the truth of Scripture (to my understanding) being this, *viz. That Jesus Christ did in human nature, and his own person as Mediatour, or in the person of a Mediatour betwixt God and Man satisfy Divine Justice, not that we might be reputed to have satisfied in and by him, or that his very satisfaction should be imputed to us, but that no such satisfaction should be required of us; and that*

that his fulfilling of the law of Mediatorship was accepted of God not as our fulfilling either of that law (for the law of Mediatorship belonged not to us, it being peculiar to Christ himself) or of any other law whatsoever: but it was reckoned, reputed, or accepted by God as a satisfaction for our not fulfilling the law of God imposed upon mankind: I mean, the law in the rigour of it, or as a covenant of works, and that such an exact fulfilling of the law should not be exacted of us as the covenanted condition of our salvation, but that faith and sincere obedience to the Gospel of Christ should be so required. And I am glad to perceive, that in asserting the end of Christs satisfaction for mankind, I have the concurrence of the Authour of the Book lately published, styled (*The interest of Reason in Religion* —) he saying pag. 548. *It was in consequence of Christs susception to be our Sponsor (or Mediator, say I, the word Sponsor and Mediator being promiscuously used by the Apostle, as appears by comparing Heb. 7. 22. with chap. 8. 6. and this latter word being of more frequent use with the Apostle, than the former, that being only once in its usage applied to Christ in Scripture) and with respect to the obedience of his life and sacrifice of his death, as the procuring and deserving cause, that God entred into a covenant with mankind, promising to pardon their sins, receive them into favour, and crown them with life upon such terms and conditions as the Father and Son thought fit to prescribe.* In these words the word [Mankind] is remarkable, the Authour saying expressly, *That for Christs sake* [for the obedience of his life and sacrifice of his death as the deserving cause thereof] *God entred into a Covenant* [not only with a few, with the Elect only, but] *with Mankind, promising* — And I am the more glad to perceive, that I have

have the concurrence of the said Authour in asserting the Covenant of Grace to be procured for Mankind, because I shall have occasion by and by to mention some things, wherein I am necessitated (much against my will) to dissent from him, and certain others of my Brethren. And I shall take a fit occasion to do it in answer to an Argument for the Imputation of Christs Righteousness (in the sense disowned by my self with many others) taken from those words of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 5. 21. from which words I have seen in a certain learned Author the Argument thus formed, as shall be expressed in the beginning of the next Chapter.

C H A P. I V.

An Objection from 2 Cor. 5. 21. answered and also retorted. The blasphemy of Mr. William Eyre in his Affize-Sermon preached at Sarum, 1652. reprov'd.

Quomodo, in what sort, or manner Christ was made sin for us, in the same manner was he made Righteousness to us. But he was made sin for us only by Imputation. Ergo—

Ans. This Argument is not at all to the purpose in hand, or the matter here in controversie, which is not, Whether Christs Righteousness be imputed to us, or whether our sins were imputed to him; for although it be not expressly, and in terms asserted in any place of the Bible, either that our sins were imputed to Christ, or that his Righteousness is imputed to us, nevertheless it is readily and unanimously

mously granted, That both of them may truly be asserted in a certain sense to be imputed, the only Question being this, *viz.* In what sense were our sins imputed to Christ, and in what sense is Christs Righteousness imputed to us, whether as Sin and Righteousness are taken properly, and formally, or else figuratively, and in the effects thereof; whether *Formaliter*, or *Effetive*, as are the School termes: And that either the one, or the other were in their formal, and essential nature imputed (our Sins to Christ, or his Righteousness to us) or otherwise imputed to him, or us, than in the fruits and effects thereof, that Scripture in 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. doth not prove. Yea, that Scripture doth plainly and convincingly prove and disprove that sense of the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, which I have, and still do both own and disown (*i. e.*) own in the said figurative and improper, but disown in the formal and proper sense of the word [Righteousness.] And for the purpose in hand, an Argument from the said Scripture may be thus formed:

In what manner, or in what sense of the word [Sin] Christ was made Sin for us, or our Sin was imputed to him, after such a manner, or in the same sense were we made the Righteousness of God in him, or his Righteousness was imputed to us;

But he was not made Sin for us, nor was our Sin [formally taken, and in its essential nature] imputed to him, but only in its poenal fruits or punishment deserved by it, *Ergo* —

For proof of the *Minor* (for the *Major* will be yielded by all those with whom I am now in the dispute) be it considered, That if our Sin it self properly in its essential nature had been imputed to Christ, then had he been reputed by God to have deserved,

deserved, or contracted the guilt of what he suffered; which if so, he could not have satisfied for us, or his sufferings be reckoned by God as satisfactory to Divine Justice.

2. The Apostle doth not say, that Christ was made a Sinner for us, nor do I know, how such a saying can be vindicated from blaspheming the Holy One of God.

3. If Sin as properly taken was imputed to Christ, and he in that sense of the word was made Sin for us, I see not, but that this blasphemy will from thence follow, viz. That God reputed Christ to be a Sinner, or made him a Sinner for us. And this is that I find in a printed Sermon preached by Mr. William Eyre at the Assizes at Sarum, 1652. and dedicated to the Council of War then sitting at Whitehall, wherein he says, pag. 10. *That such was Christs zeal for Righteousness, that to make us righteous, he was content himself to be made a Sinner.* And to abet him in his blasphemy, he alledgeth the authority of the Apostle, saying, *So the Apostle, He was made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him, 2 Cor. 5. 21.*

What? So the Apostle? Verily not so: for the Apostle says, *He was made Sin for us*, the importance of which word is not, that he was made a Sinner for us, but that he was made a Sacrifice for Sin, or a Sin-offering for us, in which sense the word *Sin* is frequently taken in the Scriptures both of the Old and New Testament, which being so obvious and well known, I need not to specify *Rom. 8. 3.*

His Text
was Psal.

45. 10.

C H A P. V.

Q. Did Christ take upon him the Guilt as well as the Punishment of our Sins? Answ. No.

A brief explication of the distinction of Guilt, commonly styled Guilt of Fault, and Guilt of Punishment; together with a Reply to what is alledged by certain late Writers out of Bishop Andrews.

Q. DID not Christ take upon him our guilt, or the guilt of our sins as well as the punishment of them?

Answ. No: Christ did not take upon him *Reatum culpæ*, guilt of fault, but only that which we call *Reatum pænæ*: the former some Casuists do stile (if I do not mistake) Obligation to fault, the latter Obligation to punishment. See Bishop *Sanderson* *De juramento. lect. 1. Sect. 12.* But, because there are, it seems, very learned men, who are otherwise minded in this matter, I think my self obliged for the truths sake to reply to certain passages, which I have lately read in some Authours, of whom two, I perceive, do alledge the authority of that most learned Bishop *Andrews* in his Sermon upon *Jer. 23. 6.* wherein having quoted the said words of the Apostle in *2 Cor. 5. 21.* he says,

Mark, how every thing is lively, and as full as can be imagined. Christ one, not only that had done no sin, but that had not so much as known sin, bath God made (not a sinner, but) sin it self, as in another place (not accursed, but) a curse it self; sin in respect of the guilt; a curse in respect of the punishment.

Answ.

The former is *Meritum pænæ*, the deserving of punishment; the latter is *Obligatio ad luen-dampnam*, an obligation to suffer the punishment it self deserved.

Ans. Under Episcopal favour I humbly crave to reply by suggesting my thoughts, as followeth :

1. If this Authour must be supposed to insinuate, that to *know* no sin doth imply more than to *do* no sin, I conceive it to be a mistake; for although To *know* no sin may be yielded to be a more significant, or as is here said, a lively expression, yet I do not think that it is significant of more than we are given to understand by that other expression [*He did no sin*] these two phrases (the one of *St. Paul*, the other of *St. 1 Peter 2. 22.*) being of the self same adequate importance. There be many phrases, that are more emphatically significant of the truth, or sense intended by the speaker, that do not imply more truth, or more of sense than other not so emphatical, but plain and downright expressions. Besides, I leave it to the consideration of the Learned, whether the expression [*He knew no sin*] be not an Hebraism, the Apostle therein speaking after the manner of the Hebrews, in whose language the word [*know*] is used for To *do*, and this both as applyed to good and evil (as were calic to exemplifie) to know good and evil being no more in true sense and construction, than to do them.

2. As it is remarkable indeed, that the Apostle doth not say, that God made Christ a Sinner, so withal it is remarkable, that he doth not say, that God made him *Sin it self*, but *Sin*.

3. The phrase [to be made *Sin it self*] seems to sound forth this sense, *viz.* To be made *Sin in it self*, which to say is to imply, that Christ was made a Sinner with a witness, a great Sinner; the word *Sce-lus* being used by Latinists sometimes for *Scelestus*. But I do not charge this sense as intended by that Renowned Authour, however it be owned by Mr. *William Eyre* in his Sermon forecited, he quoting in the

the Margin of his Book certain of the Ancients (*Austin and Hieronymus*) as asserting the same.

4. If the said Authour must be supposed to insinuate, That the phrase [*To be made sin*] is pregnant of more sense, or doth imply more, than To be made a Sinner, I can say no less, than there is no such implication, but an implication of the contrary; For To be made sin is a less thing, yea it is quite another kind of thing, than to be made a Sinner, for to be made a Sinner is to be made Culpable, *Reus culpa*, or guilty of fault, whereas to be made Sin doth imply no more than respectively to suffering to be dealt with as a Sinner, or to be made a Sin-offering, as was afore said.

5. As guilt is distinguished, or a distinct thing from punishment (these two things usually distinguished by *Reus Culpa*, & *Pena*, and sometimes by *Obligatio ad Culpam*, & *Obligatio ad Penam*, as hath been already said) Christ cannot be truly said to have been made Sin in respect of the guilt, this being in effect to say, That he was made Culpable, or a Sinner, and did thereupon deserve to suffer.

6. As [to know no Sin, and to do no Sin] are phrases of the self same adequate sense and importance, so also are the phrases [To be made a curse, and to be made accursed] the former, though more emphatically significant of the Speakers intended sense, yet not importing more sense as intended to be spoken.

7. Christ was no otherwise made Sin, than he was made a curse; for in this very respect he is in one Scripture said by the Apostle to have been *made Sin for us*, in that (as the Apostle expresseth and interprets himself in another Scripture) he was made *A Curse for us*: for he was made a Sin-offering by undergoing the cursed death of the Cross, or as Saint
Peter

Peter expresseth the matter, 1 Pet. 2.24. *By bearing our sins in his own body upon the Tree, as the Altar upon which he offered himself as a Sacrifice without any spot of Sin to God.*

C H A P. V I.

An Answer to several unjustifiable passages in Mr. Ferguson's Book, styled [The Interest of Reason in Religion—]. His false and manifold uncharitable insinuations, answered. Wherein 'tis shewed what manner of guilt or obligation to punishment that was, which Christ took upon him. That Christ did not suffer, however by occasion of that Law (Gen. 2. 17.) as transgressed, yet not by virtue thereof, as if that Law in, or by his sufferings had been executed. His mistake of the true nature of Gospel justification, demonstrated. That it is not against the essential Holiness of God (as Mr. Ferguson pretends) to justify a sinner upon an obedience (Ex parte sui, seu peccatoris) imperfect, with the reason of his mistake.

HAVING thus replied to the words of that Learned Bishop (under whose authority the Adversaries do in this contest take shelter) I shall address my self to make answer to Mr. Robert Ferguson, who being a zealous asserter of the Imputation of Christs Righteousness in the sense here disclaimed and

and oppugned by me, doth endeavour the propugnation and defence thereof in the following passages of his fore-named Book [*The Interest of Reason in Religion.*]

P.409. *I will not here discourse how inconsistent it seems with the wisdom and sapience of God to introduce a perfect righteousness, such as that of his Son was, merely to make way for his justifying us upon an imperfect righteousness, such as that of our obedience is.* Mr. Ferguson.

Ans. So far as appears to me by the reading of his Book, this Brother hath not the true notion [I do not say of justification in general, or of the word as indefinitely taken, but] of Gospel-justification, or the justification of a sinner, which neither is, nor can be otherwise than by a pardon, and this pardon is not *ex nuda Dei voluntate*, merely of divine will and pleasure, but merited by the satisfaction of Christ. Of this his mistake of the quiddity, or true nature of Gospel-justification, I may have occasion to speak, in reply to some other passages of his Book. In the mean time, I shall take it as a truth not to be gainsaid, That Gospel-justification is forgiveness of sin, this kind of justification being it alone that a sinner is a subject capable of, and thereupon I do reply, That however the matter seems to this Author, nevertheless in truth it is no way inconsistent with the wisdom of God, for the sake of his Sons most perfect righteousness, to justify or pardon sinners upon an imperfect righteousness, such as that of our obedience is, which if perfect, would have no need of pardon.

P.409. *Nor shall I argue, How that the righteousness of Christs life, and sacrifice of his death, must be imputed to us for justification, in a proportionableness to our sins, having been imputed* Mr. F.

to him, in order to his expiatory suffering.

Ans. I have already granted, that in what sense or sort our sins may be said to have been imputed to Christ, his righteousness may be said to be imputed to us, but withal declared, that neither of them can be truly so said to be imputed in the proper sense of the words (sin and righteousness) which is the sense of this Author and his Abettors, but in an improper sense, (*i. e.*) in the fruit and effects both of the one and the other.

Mr. F.

P.409,410. *To attribute Christs sufferings meerly to Gods dominion without any respect to sin, is the grossest of Socinianism, and repugnant to the Scripture in an hundred places.*

Ans. They, who deny the imputation of Christs righteousness unto us, in the sense by this Author asserted, are far from attributing Christs sufferings meerly unto Gods dominion, without any respect to sin: For as they do unanimously preach and print, that Christs sufferings had a respect to our sins, so they do attribute his sufferings not meerly to Gods dominion, without any respect to sin, but to that voluntary compact, which was betwixt the Father and the Son, that Jesus Christ should suffer for sin and sinners, and that thereby he merited our pardon.

|| Mr. F.

See amongst other Scriptures, Esa. 53. 5, 6. 1 Pet. 2. 24. Gal. 3. 13. and Dr. Stiltingfleet's vindication of them from the exceptions of Crullius.

2. Consequently I cannot forbear to say, That it doth very ill become this Author to insinuate so foul a slander against his Brethren, as guilty of Socinianism, gross Socinianism, the grossest Socinianism in this matter.

|| P.410. *To say, That our sins were imputed to Christ in the effects of them, but not in the guilt, is to contradict all principles of reason. For guilt and obnoxiousness to punishment being equipollent phrases, he cannot be supposed to have been made liable*

to the last upon the account of our sins, without having been brought under the first. Nor is it imaginable, how without submitting to the guilt of our sins he could have been punished, should it be granted that without respect to them he might have suffered: Though without any habitude to sin his sufferings might have been dolorous, yet they could never have been penal.

Ans. 1. To say, That our sins were imputed to Christ in the effects of them, (*i. e.*) in the deserved punishment thereof, but withal to deny, that our guilt of fault was imputed to Christ, is not to contradict all principles, nor any one principle of reason.

2. Nor doth it at all contradict any of those Scriptures alledged by this Author in the Margin of his Book, which Scriptures do only prove an imputation of our sins to Christ, in the sense I own and acknowledg, (*i. e.*) in Christ his undergoing suffering for them, but not in his taking our guilt upon him. And as Dr. *Stillingsfleet* doth well maintain the imputation of our sins to Christ in the former respect, (*i. e.*) the effects of them, so I am perswaded, that that most learned Doctor is a man of more reason and better principled, than to maintain the imputation of our guilt to Christ, as this Author would have it.

3. I grant, That guilt and obnoxiousness to punishment are equipollent phrases; but I deny, that it will follow from thence, that because Christ took upon him to suffer the punishment, which we for our sins deserved, he did therefore take upon him our guilt. He did indeed take upon him a certain guilt, or obligation to suffering; (*i. e.*) a guilt, or obligation peculiar to himself, but not the same guilt that lay upon us, not our guilt, not

the same numerical guilt, (for Philosophy tells us, that an accident being removed from the subject peristheth) nor the same specifical guilt, (*i. e.*) of the same sort, but a guilt specifically different, not having the same, but a far different *Substratum*, ground, foundation, or efficient, from ours; ours being *Violata Legis*, grounded or founded upon our transgression of Gods Law, but his *Sponsionis propria*, an obligation of contract or consent, founded upon the agreement betwixt him and his Father in that behalf. Obligation to punishment we stile guilt, and our guilt was guilt of fault, and of suffering for our fault, from or by vertue of Gods Law threatning the same; but Christs guilt was only guilt of suffering for our fault, arising from, or by vertue of his voluntary undertaking and compliance with the will of his Father. Briefly, That Law of God, which did threaten man with suffering for sin, did not oblige Christ to suffer for it, or us, nor did he die by vertue of that Law threatning man with death, upon supposition of his sin, *Gen. 2. 17.* nor was that Law fulfilled, or executed in his death, but by occasion of that sin-threatning Law transgressed by man, he did voluntarily oblige himself in the person of a Mediator to suffer, and to suffer death for us, or for our sins, (*i. e.*) the expiation of them.

4. Christ may well be supposed to be liable to suffering upon the account of our sins, by vertue of the said contract betwixt him and his Father, without having been brought under our personal specifical guilt. And it is easily imaginable, that without submitting to our personal guilt, he might suffer such suffering as was equivalent to that punishment, which we by our sins had deserved. This is as easily imaginable, as to imagine, how *St. Paul* should take

take upon himself to satisfy for the damage, which was done to *Philemon*, by the injury of his unfaithful servant *Onesimus*, and was willing to have the same imputed to him, (as the word signifies, *Philem.* 18.) and yet not submit unto or take upon him *Onesimus* his personal guilt of defrauding, or wrong-doing. And (to speak the very truth) in such a sense as *St. Paul* was willing to take upon himself the wrong done to *Philemon* by *Onesimus*, and to have it reckoned to him, saying, *τίνα ἑμοὶ ὀφείλω*, impute it unto me, (meaning thereby not *Onesimus* his personal guilt, *Reatum culpæ*, or his sin it self, but the effects of it, in the damage thereby sustained by his Master.) In the like sense (I say) were our sins reckoned or imputed to Christ, he taking upon him an obligation by his doings and sufferings, to satisfy for the damage or wrong done to God, (as I may so say) I mean, to vindicate the Honour and Authority of the Law and Law-giver, to demonstrate the justice of God, his hatred of sin. — And indeed herein, *viz.* in an aptitude for the attainment of these and the like ends of God our Maker, Ruler, Law-giver, Benefactor, better than the damnation of all mankind could have done, consisteth the meritoriousness and satisfactoriness of Christs doings and sufferings; and this is the reason of our styling them satisfactory or meritorious.

5. Though we deny, that Christ took upon him our guilt of sin, yet it will not follow from thence, that we deny his sufferings to have had any habitude, or respect at all to sin, as is here insinuated by this Author; for had it not been for our sin, he had never suffered.

6. Forasmuch as Christs sufferings had not the self same individual or kind of habitude to sin, as

our sufferings, in case we had suffered according to our desert, would have had, (*i. e.*) forasmuch as Christs sufferings were not inherited, or inflicted on him, by or upon account of any sin of his own, therefore are his sufferings to be accounted rather dolorous than penal, I mean, punishments in a strict, and the most proper acceptation of the word; punishment being properly and strictly *Malum tri-
stie*, inflicted upon a guilty person *propter malum
turpe*. Proper punishment I conceive to be the effect of proper guilt, which is *Reatus Criminis* [Guilt of fault] not merely *Contractus* [of Con-
tract] as Christs was.

Mr. F. P.410. *'Tis a thing utterly unintelligible, how
Christ could be made sin for us, and have our punish-
ment transferred to him, without a previous impu-
tation of sin, and the derivation of its guilt upon
him.*

Ans. What this Author hath asserted to be
unsupposable, unimaginable, and here asserts to be
utterly unintelligible, I have already, as I am per-
swaded, made plain, obvious and easie to be un-
derstood by every intelligent, impartial, unprepos-
sessed Reader, and I shall shew my self ready to do
it further, as this Author shall minister occa-
sion.

Mr. F. P.410. *Now by proportion, If our sins were im-
puted to Christ otherwise than merely in the effects of
them, so must likewise the righteousness of his life
and sacrifice of his death be otherwise imputed to us,
than merely in the benefits of them.*

Ans. Having made it apparent in my forego-
ing Answers to this Authors arguings, that our
sins in the propriety of the word were not impu-
ted to Christ, or otherwise imputed to him, than
in the effects of them, I may well and warranta-
bly

bly infer by proportion, that the righteousness of Christs life and sacrifice of his death (his doings and sufferings formally and properly taken) are not imputed unto us, or otherwise imputed than merely in the benefits of them.

P. 411. *Neither will I press, how that secluding Mr. F. not only the righteousness of Christs life, but the satisfaction of his death, as the matter, and the imputation of it, as the formal cause of justification, it seems repugnant to the immutability and essential holiness of God to justify us upon an imperfect obedience, the Law which requireth a perfect obedience remaining still in force, and denouncing wrath, in case of every failure.*

Ans. By these words it appears again, that this Author doth mistake the true notion and right conception of Gospel-justification, he supposing, that the righteousness of Christs life and satisfaction of his death is the matter, and that the imputation of it is the formal cause thereof; whereas the unquestionable truth (to my simple understanding) is, that if we speak of matter in a proper sence, as here, *viz.* for a material cause, in way of contradistinction to a formal cause, neither the righteousness of Christs life, nor satisfaction of his death, can fitly be said to be the matter, or material cause of a sinners justification; the satisfactoriness both of his life and death (of his doings and sufferings) being undoubtedly the external impulsive, or morally efficient cause thereof; and how one and the same thing should put on the habitude of two causes so different in kind, as is the material and efficient (that being internal, and *pars constitutiva rei*, and this wholly external) I do not understand, such a conception being altogether contrary to the Logick, which hitherto I have been acquainted with.

2. Whereas this Author and others make the Imputation of Christs righteousness, to be the formal cause of justification, I do clearly conceive them mistaken, and that the *formalis ratio*, or formal cause of Gospel-justification, is forgiveness of sin, this being *Res ipsa*, the very thing it self, wherein the justification of a sinner doth consist.

3. Had this Author rightly apprehended or minded, that a sinners justification is, or doth consist in, the pardon of his sin, he would scarce have questioned it as a thing in the least wise repugnant to the immutability and essential holiness of God, to justify us upon an imperfect obedience: For what though it may be granted, that the Law, which requireth a perfect obedience, and denounceth wrath in case of every failure, doth remain still in force (*i. e.*) so far forth as to command the one, and to threaten the other, yet I presume he will not, I am sure he ought not to say, That that original Law (the Law of works, I presume, he means) doth still stand in its primitive force, as a Covenant of works, both promising life to sinners upon perfect obedience, or conditionally upon their not being sinners, and threatening death unavoidably upon every failure. Doth this Author forget, That there is a Law of Grace, of oblivion, a *Lex remedians*, a Law of indemnity enacted by God through the blood of Christ, whereby the force of that Law so threatening, may as to the execution of the threatening, be vacated by a gracious pardon, and certainly so shall be, upon a sinners sincere however imperfect obedience to the Gospel of Christ?

4. This Author seems to think, that a sinner is justified in respect of the *precept*, or preceptive part of the Law, (*i. e.*) as one who had in and by Christ

Christ performed all manner of duty, whereas a sinner is justified only in respect of the *sanction* of the Law, (*i. e.*) as one, who notwithstanding his failings, hath right to impunity, and to a discharge for Christs sake by a pardon.

CHAP. VII.

That the Scripture doth no where assert a surrogation of Christ in our room, in such a strict Law-sence, as that we may be said in and by him to have done and suffered what he did and suffered, and in or by him to have redeemed our selves. And that Christ did not in such a Law-sence, represent us as Proctors and Attorneys do their Clients, Ambassadors their Princes, or Guardians their Pupils, acting accordingly in our names, but officiating as a Mediator betwixt God and Man. The evil Consequences charged by Mr. F. upon the contrary Doctrine, are denied. His thwacking Contradiction imputed to others, avoided by them, and retorted upon himself.

P. 411. **N** Either shall I urge, how there can have Mr. F.
 been no surrogation of Christ in our room; nor can we properly be said to be redeemed by him as our substitute, if all redounding to us by his death, be only the procurement of the Gospel-Covenant,

nant, in which God upon such conditions as he there requires, undertakes to pardon our iniquities and sins. A surrogation in our room and stead to acts and sufferings, which are not in a Law-sence accounted ours, I am so far from understanding, that without admitting injustice in the Rector, who allows the substitution, it seems to me a thwacking contradiction; especially if we consider, that Christ was our substitute to make satisfaction to the demands of the Law and not of the Gospel; and that by his obedience and death he hath only freed us from what we were obnoxious to upon failure of perfect obedience, but not at all from what we were liable to in case of unbelief, and want of sincere obedience.

Answer. 1. The Scripture no where asserts such a surrogation of Christ in our room, as that we can properly be said to be redeemed by him as our substitute: For had he been in a strict proper sence our substitute, there is cause to assert, That we have in and by him redeemed our selves, yea that we rather have redeemed our selves than he us, or That we are our own Redeemers rather than Christ: For what is done by a proper substitute, is not in a Law-sence so much his act who doth it, as ours, whom he as our surrogate and substitute doth personate or represent, let the representation be *Quocunq; modo*, or *quacunq; ratione*, (*i. e.*) whether he represent us by our own will, consent, or constitution, (as Proctors and Attorneys do their Clients, that pay and receive moneys, and transact matters in their names, and Ambassadors, who are employed by Princes to deal with forreign States and Nations) or by allowance and authority of Law, (as what Tutors and Guardians do in the name of their Pupils) in these cases whatsoever is done by such substitutes in the person of another,

another, is not so properly and in Law-construction his act who doth it, as theirs whose substitute he is, and whose person he doth represent.

2. Forasmuch as this Author doth assert such a surrogation of Christ in our room, as that we can properly be said to be redeemed by him as our substitute, if he shall notwithstanding that assertion deny, That we have in and by Christ redeemed our selves, or are in and by him our own Redeemers, it behoves him to consider, how he can avoid the just imputation of that thwacking contradiction, which upon his swopping mistake he insinuates his adversaries in this point to be guilty of. And it concerns him also to consider, how his *Hypothesis* can be maintained, without admitting that injustice (which he mentions) in the Rector, who notwithstanding his allowance of the said substitution, doth deny instantly to confer upon us the benefits of Christs redemption and satisfaction, these being no other than what we our selves have in and by Christ made a full satisfaction for, and which upon that account we may fitly and properly be said to have purchased for our selves.

3. Whatsoever bad consequences there be of Christs being our surrogate and substitute, in such a strict Law-sence as he doth fancy to himself, there is no such repugnancy or contradiction, as here he speaks of, that doth follow from what we do assert in this matter, *viz.* That Christ our Passover was sacrificed for us, that he died for our sins as a ransom, sacrifice, atonement, or propitiation; and forasmuch as he suffered for our sakes, and in our stead, (*i. e.*) such suffering as was equivalent to what we deserved, and such as was fit to attain the ends designed by our Creator and Redeemer, better than the damnation of all mankind could

could have done, we do not deny, but that our sins may be said to be imputed to Christ, and his sufferings to us, but neither of them properly and in their essential nature, not our sin it self to him, or his sufferings themselves to us, but both of them in their effects, our sin to him in its penal, and his sufferings to us in its saving effects. And this as we do, so we may very well and warrantably maintain, notwithstanding it be yielded (as the truth is) That Christ was substituted or given of God, to make satisfaction to the demands of the Law and not of the Gospel, in the sence here specified by this Author.

CHAP. VIII.

Mr. Ferguson's mistake in thinking, that a sinner by his justification is freed from the guilt of punishment and fault too. That Christs righteousness is not more, or otherwise imputed to us for, in, towards, or in order to our justification, than the remission of our sin. The nature of justification [forensic] opened, both of justification indefinitely considered, as also of Gospel-justification in special. The truth of the matter laid down in several Propositions.

Hitherto I have related the arguings of this Author word for word, as I find them continued.

8
 nued together from p.409. to p.412. and accordingly the Reader may, if he please, take view of them all as contiguous. But forasmuch as I judg'd it most conducive to the conviction of gain-sayers, and to the edification of all, to shape my reply thereunto, *à mè rien*, period by period, I have therefore accordingly recited them, and suited my reply to every distinct period in those pages. As for his ensuing arguings in the same Chapter to the close thereof, I cannot in such sort recite them *verbatim*, without the transcribing of seven or eight whole pages, from p.413. to p.421. nor will it be at all necessary so to do, it being fully satisfactory to demonstrate, that his arguings do proceed upon his utter mistake of the true nature of Gospel-justification, or that peculiar kind of justification, whereof a sinner is the subject, or subjective matter; and for the manifestation thereof be it considered, That he premiseth these two things, p.413, 414. 1. That to justify is in its proper acceptation here a forenlick term, signifying to acquit and absolve one that is accused. 2. That justification not only supposeth us to be indited, but withal imports an absolution from the charge of that Law, of the breach whereof we are accused, *viz.* The Law of perfect obedience, which is not abrogated by the Law of faith, but doth remain in force, and we being all guilty of the violation of its terms, there lyes accordingly a charge against us, from which by justification we are, as he says, to be acquitted.

Now yielding to the former of the two premises, which he proves by several Scriptures apt to the purpose, I reply to the latter, That there being a two-fold guilt, which the Law of God, being violated, may be supposed to accuse us of, or charge

charge us with (the ignorance or non-observance of which distinction, is the cause of great confusion and misunderstanding in the doctrine of justification) viz. guilt of fault, and guilt of punishment; (*i. e.*) actual obligation to punishment, it is the great mistake of this Author (as of many other of our Brethren) to think, that by justification we are freed or acquitted from both the said kinds of guilt, or (as some do imagine) that by pardon of sin we are freed from the latter kind of guilt, and by justification with the perfect righteousness of Christ imputed to us, from the former. Whereas the truth is, That the righteousness of Christ is no more, nor otherwise imputed to or for the justification of a sinner, than it is to or for the non-imputation, (*i. e.*) the pardon of his sins, and that there is no possibility for a sinner by any plea whatsoever, to be justified or acquitted from the former kind of guilt, I have already manifested, and shall farther manifest according to occasion in the sequel of this Treatise. In the mean time I will speak somewhat more at large for the due understanding of the nature of justification, both as indefinitely considered, and specially, as the subject thereof is a sinner. And in order thereunto I will lay down the following Propositions.

Propos. 1.

1. Justification as indefinitely taken, or as abstracted from the consideration of the special quality of the person justified, is the absolution of a person suppos'd to be accused from the guilt that he is charged with, and according to the quality of the person accused (guilty or not guilty) such is the nature of his justification. If innocent, he is justified *à reatu culpæ*, from guilt of fault, or from having deserved any punishment, through any fault he is charged with. In this sence the word is ta-

Acti

ken in many Scriptures, as in *Dent. 25. 1. Esa. 5. 23.* And so I conceive the word is taken in *1 Cor. 4. 4.* Only it is to be understood, that *St. Paul* there speaks of that kind of justification, which is commonly styled *Justificatio cause*, not *persona*, his meaning being, not that he was conscious to himself of no sin at all, but not of insincerity or unfaithfulness in his stewardship or Ministerial office, in which respect he was able to justify himself, although that was a thing comparatively not so material, so far as he must stand to the final sentence of God the Judge of all.

2. If the person accused be guilty or culpable, *Propos. 2.* his justification is of another kind or nature, the only justification which such a person is capable of, being from another charge, *viz.* from the guilt of punishment, (*i. e.*) from his being actually bound over to suffer, and from the suffering it self of that punishment, which for his delinquency he deserved. With the former kind of justification, no flesh living (all being sinful flesh) can possibly be justified. God himself (with Reverence to the divine Majesty be it spoken) hath no kind of power to justify any wicked person, no moral power, (for it is a sinful thing so to justify the wicked, *Exod. 23. 5. Prov. 17. 15.*) nor physical power, (for the thing is simply impossible, and doth imply a contradiction.) But with the other kind of justification, any flesh living (though never so sinful) may and shall through Gospel-faith and obedience, or an obediencial faith, be justified.

3. As justification and forgiveness of sin are obviously and vulgarly taken, or according to common usage of speech, so they are contrary the one to the other, as is light and darkness: For to justify a person in common use of the word, is to free

or

or absolve him from guilt of fault, to acquit him as innocent from the fact or fault of which he is wrongfully accused. And this kind of justification is by a two-fold plea, either the denial of the fact, (hereby *David* justified himself from the imputations of *Saul*, 1 *Sam.* 24. 9, 10.) or by denying the fault, pleading the fact to be no fault, or breach of any Law, whether of God, (by which plea *Daniel* justified himself against the accusation of his professed enemies, *Dan.* 6. 22.) or man, or both, (by which plea *St. Paul* justified himself against the accusations of his Countrey-men the *Jews*, *Act.* 24. 14.) maintaining his innocency not only in respect of the Law of God, but also of *Cæsar*, *Act.* 25. 8. there being no Acts at that time made by any of the *Cæsars* against Christian Religion, nor till the fifth year of the reign of *Claudius*, as History doth report. So that if a person be justified in this vulgar sence of the word, he is not so much as in a natural capacity of being pardoned, nor if pardoned, of being so justified as aforesaid; pardon of sin and justification in the said vulgar sence, being of so contrary a nature, that if the one be affirmed of any person, the other must needs be denied. And in this sence of the word (justify) this Author speaks truth in saying, p. 416. *That as to justify and to pardon are not only wholly distinct in their Natures and Idea's, but always separated in the cases of such as are arraigned at humane tribunals, (unless it be where the substitution of one person in the room of another is allowed) and even then, though they accompany one another, yet they are both distinct acts, and we have distinct notions of them: For neither can an accused innocent by being acquitted be said to be pardoned, nor a condemned criminal by having the execution of his sentence remitted, be said to be justified.*

I never heard of the substitution of one person in the room of another, to have been allowed in criminal cases, whatever allowance there hath been in pecuniary mulcts, or matters,

4. How;

4. However in common usage, justification and remission of sin are not only divers, but also adverse things, nevertheless if we speak of that peculiar kind of justification frequently mentioned in the Scripture, whereof a sinner is the subject, and of that kind of pardon, that is peculiar to sinners so oft there mentioned, (a pardon conveyed by Law, and purchased by the satisfaction of Christ, not that kind of pardon, which is *ex nudâ voluntate*) if, I say, we do speak of this kind of justification and pardon, then I do affirm it as an undoubted truth, That justification and pardon of sin are words equivalent, importing one and the self same thing, without any real or substantial difference, for proof whereof, two or three Texts of Scriptures may suffice (among several others) to be produced.

Act. 13. 38, 39. Be it known to you, that through this man is preach'd unto you the forgiveness of sins, and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which you could not be justified by the Law of Moses, (i. e.) for which the Law of Moses admitted no expiatory sacrifice in order to pardon. *Rom. 3. 24, 25.* Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God, to declare I say at this time his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him who is of the faith of Jesus, (i. e.) of the Christian faith. See also *Rom. 4.* where that which he calls blessedness, v. 9. and Gods justifying the ungodly, v. 5. he sty-leth Gods forgiving their iniquities, and covering their sins. Thence that of *Grotius de satisfactione*, p. 38. *Justificatio passim in sacris literis, maxime in Epistolis Paulinis, absolutionem significat, quæ præ-*

D supposito

Supposito peccato consistit in peccatorum remissione, ipso Paulo semet clare explicante, praesertim Rom. 4. I might hereto add the testimony of other Authors famous in their generation, were it needful.

By the way take notice, That I have said nothing concerning his affirming, that the introduction of the Law of faith hath not abrogated the Law of perfect obedience, but this as well as that doth remain in force; nor do I think it necessary so to have done: For although some choose to say, that that Law of our Creation, or of God our Creator, is abrogated or repealed, (there being no Law since the new modelling of the government of mankind, but the Law of Redemption, or of God our Redeemer, the moral part of the original Law being taken into it as the matter thereof) and others choose to assert only a dispensation or relaxation of that Law, nevertheless I do humbly conceive, that (all things considered, yet not so needful here to be mentioned, that are said on both sides) there is no real difference between them as to substance of truth. but only in modes and manner of speaking, and for that cause I can give liberty to any one to speak the truth with due caution, in what words he pleaseth. Only I must say, That I dare not take liberty to my self to say, That the Law of works doth now remain in force as well as the Law of faith, without a just explication, how far it doth and doth not remain now in force. I well remember, that two late worthy Authors do very differently express themselves, touching the immediate effect of the introduction of the Law of faith. The most learned Mr. George Lawson chooseth to say, That the original Law (of works) is by the Law of faith or indemnity abrogated and repealed; whereas Mr. Joseph Truman will not allow

allow that saying, instead thereof asserting it to be only relaxed, or dispenced with, and he gives reasons for what he says. But because his reasons are not (I think) so convincing, as to be incapable of a satisfactory reply, and forasmuch as I do apprehend the difference betwixt them (all things considered) to be rather verbal, than real, I can therefore leave every man to his own choice, in wording the matter as he pleaseth. Only I shall say, That although I do not impute any error of judgment to Mr. F. in saying, [*That the introduction of the Law of faith, hath not abrogated the Law of perfect obedience, but this as well as that remaineth in force*] nevertheless forasmuch as such sayings do need explication, I wish for the truths sake, that such sayings were not roundly and simply uttered, or without due caution and explication.

The premisses considered, it is easie what judgment to make of several passages in this Author, which I will now recite, and briefly animadvert upon.

C H A P. I X.

That those who assert, That the Law of works is abrogated, do in substance of truth accord with those, who choose rather to express themselves, saying, It is relaxed or dispenced with. God in justifying a sinner doth not pronounce him just and righteous, that is, no sinner. A sinner not otherwise made just and righteous by his being justified, than by his being pardoned through Christ. That a sinner cannot possibly be justified from the accusation of the Law, in its charging him to be a sinner.

Mr. F. P. 415. **A**ND indeed the Socinians express themselves in this more consonantly to their principles, than some others do: For having stated the whole of justification in the remission of sin, upon performance of the conditions of the Gospel, in pursuance of this they accordingly plead for the utter abrogation of the Law.

Answ. 1. What the Socinians do hold concerning the abrogation, or non-abrogation of the sanction of the Law, I concern not my self to know. This only will I say, That by how much the Socinians are more obliged to this Author, for his charity towards them in this matter, by so much are those his Brethren (the some intended by him) upon a contrary score bound to con him the less thanks.

2. As I said before, so I say again, That those Brethren who do hold, that the Law of works is abrogated, and those who say, it is not abrogated

or

or repealed, but dispenced with and relaxed, do both of them agree in this truth, *viz.* That there is a Law still in force, that doth command perfect obedience, under the penalty of damnation, (the only difference between them, for ought I know, being in this, *viz.* By what Law it is now required, or by what name that Law is to be styled, whether the Law of works, or the Law of grace, wherein say the former it is indeed required, under the penalty of damnation, but not peremptorily and unavoidably *ex parte Legis*, as it was in the Law of works, but with a Proviso, as to the execution thereof.) Now forasmuch as our Brethren do univerfally accord as aforefaid, I judge this Author to be unjust in determining, that the *Socinians* do exprefs themselves more confonantly to their principles, than some others do.

The Author arguing for justification, its being a different thing from pardon of sin, because otherwise we cannot in any propriety of speech, be said to be justified from the accusation of the Law, he saith in that case as followeth.

P. 416. *Pardoned indeed we may be, but justified Mr. F. in a proper sence we cannot. For to suppose God to pronounce a person just that is unjust, or to declare him righteous that is unrighteous, is to make him pronounce a sentence that is unjust and false, and to act repugnantly to his own holy and righteous nature.*

Ans. As to the justification of a sinner from the accusation of the Law, whether it is, or may be properly or no so called, I shall speak my thoughts by and by, in my Answer to a Question that shall be put expressly for that purpose. Mean while it may be sufficient to say, 1. That if by just and unjust this Author doth mean a sinner and no sinner,

(as for ought I know he doth, and agreeably to his principle, touching the imputation of Christs righteousness to us, in its essential nature, he must mean) he doth utterly mistake the nature of justification in thinking, That a sinner through the imputation of Christs righteousness is of unjust made just, (*i. e.*) of a sinner made perfectly righteous, and freed from guilt of fault, the impossibility whereof I have already spoken of.

2. A sinner is no otherwise of unjust and unrighteous made just and righteous, by being justified, than by being pardoned; and what kind of righteousness that is, wherewith he is by his justification or pardon made just and righteous, I will at large declare in Answer to a Question, which shall be the subject of another Chapter.

3. Forasmuch as it hath been already proved, that a sinner cannot possibly be discharged from the Law, its accusation of him as a sinner, or its charging him with the guilt of sin, this Author must needs err in thinking, that in any manner of sense (proper or improper) a sinner can be said to be justified from the same.

C H A P. X.

That the difference betwixt remission and Gospel-justification is not at all in this, viz. That remission is the result of mercy, and the act of one exercising favour, and justification the off-spring of justice, as Mr. F. says. The usage of words in common speech, sometimes in signification contrary to that of Scripture, exemplified in the language of our Brethren of Scotland. Mr. Ferguson's notorious mistake in asserting, That to justify is no where in the Scripture-usurpation equipollent with to forgive.

THE difference betwixt remission of sin and Justification, he doth specify in the following words.

P. 417. *Remission is 'the result of mercy, and the* Mr. F.
act of one exercising favour; but Justification is the off-spring of justice, and imports one transacting with us in a juridical way, without the infringement of Law or equity.

Ans. These words are true, if understood of Remission, *ex nuda voluntate*, and of the Justification of a person innocent. But if understood of Gospel-Justification [the Justification of a sinner] and of Gospel-pardon, (which for kind is both a pardon derived to us by Law, and purchased for us by a satisfactory price) they are notoriously untrue: For as we are freely justified, so we are freely pardoned by divine grace, through the Redemption that is in Christ Jesus, *Rom. 3. 14. Eph.*

1. 7. Gods Justice and gracious favour joyntly concurring no less to the one , than to the other.

2. As it is best known to the Author himself, what kind of Remission and Justification he intended in those words, so it is too too suspicious by his words immediately following, that he did mean Gospel-Pardon and Gospel-Justification, which words of his I shall recite, and leave it to the Judgment of the impartial Reader , what his meaning was.

Mr. F.

P:417. *The word Justific, neither in its Etymology, nor application and usage, according to the institution of men, and least of all in the Scripture-usurpation, is equipollent to pardon, nor coincident with to Forgive.*

Ans. 1. However it may be in some respects useful to know the Etymology and usage of common speech, nevertheless this is not so much to be regarded in the stating or determining of any Question pertaining to Divinity, the usage of words in Scripture being as the Pole-Star, to direct the course of our conceptions (as I may so say) in such matters: And for that cause I cannot but commend that passage of this Author, he saying, p. 155. *That that which is chiefly to be attended unto in the fencing of Scripture, is the use of words in sacred Writers, God being many times pleased to restrain or enlarge the signification of words, as in his wisdom he judgeth meet.* And I do the rather mind the Author of this his saying, because if we regard the Etymology of the word Justific, it will (to speak the least) as much favour the Popish fencing of the word, (these fencing it To Sanctifie, or to make just, *sensu physico*, (i.e.) by infusion of grace) as the Protestants interpretation thereof, who do

con-

construe it *sensu juridico*, to make just by apology, defence, or plea.

2. As for the usage of words in common speech, this is sometimes contrary to their common usage in Scripture, as I have already declared in the use of the word *Justifie*, this signifying in common usage, to absolve or acquit a person *à reatu culpæ*, (*i. e.*) as innocent and not guilty. And because this Author (as I guess by his name) is a *Scotchman*, I shall therefore put him in mind, That whereas to be justified and to be pardoned are all one in the usage of Scripture, they are contrary in the usage of *Scotland*, to be justified there being not to be pardoned, but to be hang'd, our *Scotch Brethren* using to say, That a man is justified, when he is hang'd or executed; as I learn from the worthy Dr. *Hammond*, in his Notes upon some place of the Epistle to the *Romans*.

3. It is a most notorious mistake in this Author to assert, as here he doth expressly, That to Justifie is least of all (meaning thereby in obvious construction not at all) in the Scripture-usurpation, equipollent to pardon, nor coincident with *to forgive*. The not observing of the contrary truth, which hath been already proved by several Scriptures, I do judg to be the occasion of other errors in this matter, whereupon I may sadly take up the old saying, *Hinc illæ lachrymæ*. The Authors next ensuing words to be animadverted upon, are as followeth.

C H A P. X I.

Mr. Ferguson's mistake in saying, That we are made Righteous With the Righteousness of Christ, as also Dr. Owen's in his Book styled (Communion with the Trinity) refuted, and that in Rom. 5. 18. alledged by him, answer'd, wherein is declared, That it is one thing to be justified By, and another thing to be justified With the Righteousness of Christ. The Doctor's misinterpretation of Phil. 3. 9. and Eph. 2. 8. That the asserting of the whole of Justification, to consist in remission of sin, hath no such evil consequences, as Mr. F. chargeth it with.

Mr. F. P. 413, 416, 419. **S**O that upon the whole, If we be not made Righteous with the perfect Righteousness of Christ imputed to us, but that God only for the sake of Christ will dispence with the rigour of the Law, and — I dare affirm, that Justification as it is opposed to the accusation of the Law, its charging us with guilt, and its passing sentence of condemnation against us thereupon, doth not admit a proper sence in the whole Scripture, but must every where be construed Metaphorically; and that the import of it is, not that we are properly and in a Law-sence justified, but that such benefits accrue to us by Remission of sin, as if we were so. According to the sentiments of our Author, we are only pardoned, but by reason of some allusion betwixt the advantages redounding to us by forgiveness, and the priviledges, immu-

immunities and benefits, which ensue upon a proper Justification, we are therefore Metaphorically said to be justified. It were to bid defiance to the Scripture in an hundred places, to say that we are not at all justified, and yet in effect their principles imply no less: For by stating the whole of our assuagement, from the accusation of the Law in remission of sin, they indeed say, that we are not justified, only we are improperly said to be so.—

Ans^r. 1. It is the error of this Author, as of many others to say, that we are made Righteous With the perfect Righteousness of Christ imputed to us. And among others, I perceive Dr. Owen doth err in this particular, which because he pretends to prove by certain Scriptures in his late Vin-dication, p. 102, 103. I will for the truths sake reply thereunto. 1. He alledgeth, Rom. 5. 18. By his obedience we are made Righteous, made so truly (says he) and accepted. To which I answer, 1. That Scripture proves not the Doctor's purpose, nor is pertinent thereunto; for the Apostle doth not say as the Doctor would have him, *With* whose obedience, but *By* whose obedience we are made Righteous; now we may be truly said to be made Righteous *By* it, though we neither are, nor can be truly said to be made Righteous *With* it: For,

2. These two Monosyllables (*By* and *With*) are very much different in signification, the former particle [*By*] implying the nature, energy, or interest of an efficient, and as here applied, morally efficient, or meritorious cause, the latter particle [*With*] pregnantly importing the nature, or interest of a formal cause. Now inasmuch as the Doctor is a man of such reading and learning, as that he cannot be ignorant of the true state of the Question,

D^r. O.

tion, about the Imputation of Christs Righteousness unto us, (it being not at all touching the meritorious cause of our Justification, whether we are justified By Christs Righteousness, but about the formal cause, whether we are justified With Christs Righteousness imputed, as some say, or With the Imputation thereof, as say some others, (*i. e.*) with the very thing it self imputed to us, or with the imputation thereof in its formal or essential nature.) I say, Forasmuch as this Doctor cannot but know these things, it did ill become his learning and ingenuity, to hood-wink the eyes of the vulgar Reader, from seeing the true state of the Question, and consequently from perceiving, how nothing at all to the purpose in hand this Scripture is, that is alleged by him.

3. There is not the least whisper of the obedience of Christ as Imputed to us, or of the Imputation of Chrills obedience to us, in that of *Rom. 5. 18.* For though the Apostle says, *By his obedience*, yet he doth not say, *By his obedience Imputed to us*, or *By the Imputation of his obedience we are made Righteous.* No, as to the words (*Imputed, and Imputation*) there is *Altum silentium*, not a word or syllable.

2. The Doctor adjoyns thereunto, *Phil. 3. 9.* saying, That this is that, which the Apostle desires to be found in, in opposition to his own righteousness. To which I answer, That the righteousness wherein *St. Paul* did there desire to be found, was not the obedience or righteousness of Christ, in opposition to his own evangelical obedience, (as the Doctor here says, and too too many with him) but his own evangelical obedience, or the sincere practice of Christian Religion, together with the blessed consequents and benefits thereof,

thereof, or promised through Christ thereunto, in opposition to a Judaical righteousness (styled his own, he being a perfect Jew by descent, an Hebrew of the Hebrews) with all its carnal privileges, of which that Nation did so much boast, which notwithstanding being put in competition with those of Christianity, were in his esteem no better than dung, than that we call Garbage, or Dogs-meat, as is the importance of the word there used by him, whereby to express his contempt in the highest degree. That this is the true meaning of the Apostle, I may have occasion farther to demonstrate. In the mean while I shall take into consideration, what the Doctor affirms concerning our own obedience or righteousness, and Christ's, he saying in these words, *This distinction the Apostle doth evidently deliver and confirm, so as nothing can be more clearly revealed*, Ephes. 2. 8, 9, 10.

To this be it answered; Of a truth I perceive, how like to the black or yellow Jaundise that distemper of the intellect is, which we call Prejudice or Prepossession, in that it makes us as confident as confidence it self, that we do see, and see evidently, and as clearly as can be, such entities, and adjuncts of entities, as have no visible existence to the eye or understanding of any impartial man: For 1. there is *nec vola, nec vestigium*, no sign or footstep of the distinction betwixt Christ's obedience and ours, in that Scripture, for ought appears to me.

2. All I see in these words is, A distinction betwixt the Grace of God, together with the obedience or works of faith, or faith wrought in us by free grace, and certain other works, in opposition unto, and contradistinction from the said Grace
and

and Faith, (*i. e.*) works wrought by their own natural strength, without the infusion of special graces, antecedent to the *Ephesians* their embracing the faith of Christ, and consequently such works, as do make for boasting.

2. Hereupon I cannot but wonder, in what term or terms of the said Scripture, the most sharp-sighted or Eagle-ey'd Divine, can perceive the obedience of Christ to be so evidently there delivered, as that nothing can be more clearly revealed. Surely the Doctor will not say, That by Grace or by Faith visibly there mentioned, is meant the obedience of Christ; for Grace and Faith and Christs obedience, are without all controversie several things, whether physically, metaphysically, or theologically considered; so that one member of the Doctor's distinction is evidently wanting in that Scripture; although I readily grant, that forasmuch as every act doth presuppose an object, faith must be understood there not as excluding, but as including the person and obedience of Christ, I will not say (though some peradventure will) as its adequate, but as its partial, however prime, object.

3. Were the obedience of Christ there expressly mentioned, nevertheless it is to be denied, That this obedience of Christ is there opposed to our obedience, (*i. e.*) to our *evangelical* obedience, or to the faithful works thereof (as the Doctor would have it) but to another kind of works, which do make for boasting, as was afore-said. And this I may perhaps endeavour to make apparent in another Treatise, and there manifest, how the Doctor doth mistake the true sence of the word (*saved*) in that Scripture, which although he interprets for justified, (and so indeed in some Scriptures it is to be

be interpreted, and it is an important truth, that Gospel-Justification is the self-same thing with salvation from the guilt of sin) nevertheless by [*saved*] in that place is meant sanctified, quickned, regenerated, *saved*, from the power of sin. This right interpretation of the word [*saved*] doth utterly make void what the Doctor says in the following lines, whereby to confirm the distinction betwixt Christs obedience and our evangelical obedience, to be there as evidently delivered, so as that nothing can be more clearly revealed.

I shall now return to the fore-cited words of Mr. *Ferguson*, to which I answer, 1. I do deny, That to assert that the precise nature of Gospel-Justification doth consist in Remission of sin, doth bid defiance to the Scripture in an hundred places, or that that Principle doth imply, That we are not at all justified. And if I should say, in compliance with the language here of this Author, I do desire Mr: *Ferguson*, to prove what he hath charged, as the effect of the said Principle, I think, I should be blameless: But I shall choose to forbear that word, it being my desire and design to reply with words of alike meekness as wisdom, whatever provocation there be to the contrary.

2. I deny, That to state the whole of our affoilment, from the accusation of the Law in Remission, is indeed to say, That we are not justified.

3. I deny, That to say, That a sinner is in an improper sence said to be justified, is indeed to say, That we are not justified. *Deus bone!* To say, That God is said in an improper

proper sence to render to a man his work, (work being put for wages , or the reward of his work) is this indeed to say , That God will not render to a man his work , or that his work shall not be rewarded of God ?

4. Because it is such an abhorring to this Author to conceive , or speak of a sinner his being in an improper sence said to be justified , I will therefore (the matter being now ripe for such a purpose) put it to the Question, as followeth in the next Chapter.

C H A P. X I I.

Q. Is a sinner said in a proper or improper sence to be justified ? In answer hereunto it is declared, 1. That the Question in it self is immaterial. 2. Nevertheless for the satisfaction of Mr. F. the Question is answered, and therein it's proved, That the Justification of a sinner is of, or in its kind a proper Justification, and in what respects so said to be, specified. An Objection answered.

Q. Is a sinner said in a proper or an improper sence to be justified ? Answ. 1. I think this Question to be too too near of affinity with those, which St. Paul in one place calls unprofitable and vain, Tit. 3. 9. and the native product whereof (as he says in another, 1 Tim. 6. 4.) are envy, strife, rail-

ings,

ings, evil surmisings; and for that cause I am convinced, that it ought not much to be disputed; it being no whit material, whether a sinner be said in a proper or improper sence to be justified; for (to use the Apostles expression, *Phil. 1. 18.*) *notwithstanding every way*, whether properly or improperly a sinner is justified truly; *I therein do rejoyce, yea, and will rejoyce*, yea and cannot otherwise than rejoyce, and rejoyce to eternity. What need there in effect to be more said to the comfort of a sinner, than what our Saviour said to the Leper, *Son, be of good chear, thy sins are forgiven thee, Mat. 9. 2.* That Leper was as happy in his having his sins forgiven him, as was the penitent Publican in departing from the Temple to his house justified, *Luk. 18. 14.*

2. Nevertheless forasmuch as an improper kind of Justification doth, I perceive, so stick in the stomach of this Brother, as that he cannot digest it, I shall for this once endeavour to prove, That a pardoned sinner may in a proper sence be said to be justified, or That a sinner justified with a pardon, is properly said to be justified. I am not ignorant, that some very learned men do distinguish of Justification in a Law-sence, into that which is properly and that which is improperly so denominated, assigning the Justification of an innocent person to the former sence of the word, and of a sinner to the latter. But for my own part I am of opinion, That both the innocent and the sinner may be truly said to be justified, *sensu forensi proprie dicto*, in a proper Law-sence: For what though the Justification of these two sort of subjects, be of a different kind, yet both of them for their kind may be proper, they being considered respectively to their different habitudes, which I will endeavour to demonstrate, as followeth.

E

The

The Charge from which an innocent person is justified, is guilt of *fault*, the Charge from which a sinner is justified, is guilt of, or obligation to *punishment*. Now why may not he, that is justified from this latter charge, be as properly in his kind said to be justified, as the former in his kind ? I know nothing should hinder, except it be said and prov'd, that the Law hinders ; but that the Law doth not hinder, I prove, Because as the case stands with sinners to God-wards, there is a standing-Law for the Justification of the one, as well as of the other ; there being a Gospel-Law for the Justification of sinners, which like the Law of the *Medes* and *Persians* is not to alter, but to stand even to the worlds end. And forasmuch as a sinners Justification is by the Law of faith or the Gospel, and in that respect is a legal kind of Justification, I do therefore judge, That this Author is clearly mistaken in his affirming, that a sinner pardoned, cannot be properly and in a Law-sence said to be justified ; for is not he, who is justified by, from, and through Law (the standing-Law of faith) justified in a Law-sence ?

2. Forasmuch as there is a two-fold Justice, (1. Of *obedience*, when all is done and left undone, which the Law did either command or forbid, and consequently no desert of penalty incur'd. 2. Of *satisfaction*, when, the breach of the Law supposed, there is due satisfaction made to the Law, in consideration of that breach) why may not he, who can plead the Justice of satisfaction, be properly said to be justified, as he in his kind, who hath performed the Justice of obedience, the former being *Rectus in Curia*, as well as the latter ? Where (by the way) if I have offended this Brother, by minding him of that [to us Englishmen
most

most uncouth] saying of his Countreymen, That a man when he is hang'd, is justified, or justified by being hang'd, I will make him satisfaction, by justifying the saying to be rational, and this upon the account of the foresaid distinction of a two-fold Justice (of obedience and of satisfaction) upon which latter account, the Malefactor executed may be reputed just, (*i. e.*) with that kind of Justice called the Justice of satisfaction, soasmuch as he, who hath suffered the penalty of the Law, hath thereby satisfied the Law. To this sence is agreeable the use of the word (Justifie) in the form of Commission issued from our King to his Judges, (as I have somewhere read) *Precipimus tibi, quod tu justicies*, We command thee, that thou shalt justifie (*i. e.*) see, that the Law be every way satisfied. But because I foresee an Objection, I will therefore answer it. *Obj. The alone satisfaction, which a sinner can plead for his pardon, is not by his own either doings or sufferings, but only by Christs, and therefore a pardoned sinner is not properly justified, or pardon of sin cannot in a proper sence be styled Justification?* *Ans.* If for this reason a sinners pardon cannot in a proper sence be styled Justification, then his pardon cannot in a proper sence be called pardon: For according to the pretence or principle of this Author, pardon of sin in a proper sence is *ex nudâ voluntate*, upon meer good will and pleasure, and without satisfaction. And if so, yet I hope, that he will not deny Gospel-pardon of sin, because it is not pardon in a proper sence. Nor can I conceive any just reason, why any man should be in less love and liking with Gospel-Justification, because it is not properly such, than with Gospel-pardon upon the same account. Whereupon I shall say, Let this Author reject, and be

displeased with both, or else with neither of them, upon the poor pretence of the impropriety of the word or words; which if he be with either of them upon any such score, all that I will say is, that I cannot help it. Only forasmuch as various ways of expressing the same thing, do much conduce to the better instruction, and more effectual conviction of an adversary, I will express my mind in another manner of distinguishing, as followeth.

As there are two integral parts of Gods Law, viz. The Precept and the Sanction, (the one constituting *Debitum Officii*, the other *Debitum Supplicii*) so there is *Sensu forensi*, a two-fold Justification; 1. With respect to the precept of the Law, when a person accused of fault can say to his Accusers, as our Saviour did, *Which of you convinceth me of sin?* 2. With respect to the penalty of the Law, when a person guilty can plead satisfaction made for his trespass or trespasses against it, and that the Law therefore is disabled from condemning him. Now because I do conceive, (as will be said more fitly in another Chapter) that satisfaction is a proper righteousness of its kind, respectively to the sanction of the Law, even as innocency is a proper righteousness of its kind, with respect to the precepts thereof, I do not therefore perceive, but that a sinner may as well and properly be said to be justified, with respect to the sanction of the Law, upon satisfaction made, as an innocent person, with respect to the precept of the Law, upon perfect obedience thereunto.

But I do so little regard, what this or any other Authors do fancy, concerning the impropriety of our being justified By, or (to speak more properly) With a pardon, that I can give them leave to think

think and speak therein as they please , being fully assured, That I am as properly said to be justified, as pardoned ; yea though neither pardoned nor justified properly , yet soasmuch as I am assured , that being pardoned and justified (properly or improperly) I am certainly pardoned and certainly justified , and shall be glorified , I am well contented with it , and am abundantly thankful to God and Christ Jesus for it.

Thus have I dared to oppose , what this Author (as he says) hath dared to affirm, *viz. That if a sinners Justification be the same thing with the Remission of his sins , then doth that his Justification not admit a proper sence in the whole Scripture , and that to say so , is in effect to say , we are not at all justified , and so to bid defiance to the Scripture in a hundred places.* And I do leave it to the judgement of every learned and impartial Reader , what sentence to pronounce both upon the one and the other, this his Affirmation, and my Opposition. I shall in the next place address myself to the answering of another Question , as followeth.

CHAP. XIII.

Q. Why, or for what reasons, may pardon of sin be called Justification, and Vice versa ? Or, What reasons are there for their promiscuous use in the N. T. ? *Ans.* In answer whereunto, 1. It is acknowledged, That the Question is in it self not so considerable. 2. Nevertheless for the satisfaction of many dissenting Brethren, in answer thereunto, several reasons of the thing are assigned and specified.

*Q. F*OR what reason or reasons, can pardon of sin be styled Justification, and Justification pardon ? *Ans.* I say concerning this Question, as of the former, That it is not very material : For if I know, that Gods pardoning mercy, as in Scripture it goes under divers other names, (Redemption, Salvation, Reconciliation, Righteousness—) goes also under the name *Justification*, I may very well rest assured, that there is a reason for it, because the only wise God will not give a name to any thing, for which there is no reason. But because this Author either is ignorant of the reasons usually rendred for it, or else doth dissemble his knowledge thereof, I will therefore for his sake, make answer to the said Question, and I desire, that my Answers may be lookt upon as a *Superpondum*, or measure running over, given into his bosom. My Answers are,

1. One Reason, why Gods saving mercy to sinners is called by different names, is taken from the divers

divers mischievous effects, or consequences of sin. Because sin doth make the sinner obnoxious unto, or binds him over to punishment, therefore is Gods saving mercy in the blood of Christ towards sinners, styled Remission, this being Gods loosing the bond, or discharging of the sinner from the said obligation.

2. If Mr. Bradshaw's opinion be right, viz. That if an offender be pardoned without any amends and satisfaction, he is not at all justified, and consequently where a fault is of that nature, as that no sufficient satisfaction or amends can be made, there can be no justification of a person so offending, then this reason will well warrant Remission of sin to be styled Justification, viz. Because our pardon is a peculiar kind of pardon, (i. e.) not *Pura puta & omni modo gratuita*, merely and in all respects free, but some way merited, viz. By the satisfaction of Christ our Mediator, whereupon God is just, and doth exercise justice in the pardoning of sinners, and consequently may be said to justify those, whom he doth upon such consideration remit.

3. But because this ground perhaps is not so justifiable and satisfactory, forasmuch as that Delinquent, that can *Quocumq; modo, seu ratione qualicumq;* produce a pardon, is justified from the accusation of being obliged to suffer the penalty of the Law, and by consequence respectively thereunto is just, *Reus in Curia*. If any, I say, be dissatisfied in that reason of Mr. Bradshaw's, I shall offer to him instead thereof this reason, viz. Remission of sin is styled Justification, because it will stand a sinner in as much stead before the Tribunal of God (the Judge of quick and dead) as a Justification upon perfect justice would do a person,

who being perfectly innocent is impleaded. This reason, I have cause to presume, will not much be regarded by this Author, but distasted rather, because he thinks, that for *this* reason a sinners Justification must needs be wholly improper, and altogether Metaphorical, which he can by no means endure. But as I have endeavoured to cure him of that his mis-conception, so I doubt not, but that this reason will be of a perfect good relish, to others of another and more sound palate.

4. Another Reason (as some think) is, because a sinner is pardoned by course of Law, his pardon is derived, or accrews to him, not as that of a Malefactor sometimes doth, by the meer will and prerogative of his Sovereign Prince, but by vertue of the Law of the Gospel, enacted as an instrument for the conveyance thereof.

As for the Reasons of Remission of sin, its being styled Justification, and Justification its being styled Remission of sin, I think they may be fitly to the purpose in hand thus expressed.

1. Gospel-Justification is styled Remission of sin, in respect of the quality of the person, who is the *Materia, circa quam*, the subject, about which that saving grace or mercy is conversant, the person or recipient subject thereof being not an Innocent, but a person in himself obnoxious, *viz.* a sinner: For Gospel-Justification though *Iusta* (just) yet it is not *Iustificatio Iusti*, but *Iniusti*, (*i. e.*) it is the discharge of a person, who in himself is unjust, from that obligation to punishment, where-with he is charged by the Law.

2. Remission of sin is in the N. T.* frequently styled Justification, in regard of the manner of its conveyance, which is not as many others, if not most pardons from man are, upon meer good will
and

and pleasure, but from Law and Covenant, which Law or Covenant is two-fold, 1. The first is a Law or Covenant peculiar to Christ, as *Persona restipulans*, God the Father therein requiring satisfaction to be made by him, and thereupon covenanting and promising, That no strict satisfaction should be exacted of the sinner. This satisfaction according to the said Law or Covenant, (as commonly styled, or as others style it, divine decree, they referring the matter to the Decretive, rather than the Legislative will of God) this satisfaction, I say, Jesus Christ did according to the said Covenant or Decree of God, and at the time appointed, most fully make; whence it is, that the Apostle says, He gave himself *Αντίλυτρον*, a counter-price, a satisfaction instead of a satisfaction, 1 *Tim.* 2.6.

2. The second Law or Covenant is that, wherein we sinners are the Restipulators, and which in Scripture is styled The Promise, The Law of Faith, The Gospel, The new Covenant—wherein God through Christ doth promise remission of sin upon certain conditions, upon performance whercof, he doth accordingly bestow it upon us.

3. Remission of sin may be styled Justification, in respect of the profit or benefit thereof, and this both special and general. 1. Special, In that it doth prevent, remove, or take away the obligation to condemnation, which is due to sinners, which condemnation is the direct opposite to Justification, as is apparent by many Scriptures. 2. In general, In that it is equivalent unto, or will prove to be of like universal benefit, privilege, or emolument to a sinner, with that kind of Justification, which is the justification of a person, who in himself is altogether just, and never was obnoxious.

Thus

A sinners
pardon
being of
a peculiar
kind from
what man-
ny other
pardons
are, as in
one re-
spect it is
pardon
granted
by God
upon the
satisfac-
tion of
Christ, so
in another
respect it
is upon
the faith
and re-
pentance
of a sin-
ner, and
in both re-
spects it
may be
said to be
a cove-
nanted
pardon,
or pardon
by a Law.

Thus have I replied to the whole of what Mr. *Ferguson* hath said in his second Chapter, concerning a sinners Justification, and the imputation of Christs Righteousness unto him. But before I proceed to reply to any other passage in his Book, which concerns the matter in hand, I will answer a Question, that will come in fitly to be proposed, by occasion of what hath been said upon this last, namely, That the justification of a sinner is By a Law.

C H A P. X I V.

Q. How is the justification of a sinner to be denominated, whether Evangelical or Legal?

Answ. Rather Evangelical, and the reason assigned. The Arguments of those on the contrary side both answered and retorted, who acknowledge, that the justification of a sinner is Evangelical ex parte principii, but would not have it absolutely to be so styled, but rather a Legal justification. The reason why this Question is debated and answered.

Q. HOW is the Justification of a sinner to be denominated, whether Evangelical, or rather Legal? Answ. I propose this Question, not for the satisfaction of Mr. Ferguson, but for the sake of some other Brethren, who may need a due information therein: And my answer is, That for-

forasmuch as that Law, by which a sinner is justified, is The Law of Faith, of Grace, or of the Gospel, it is therefore to be denominated not a Legal, but an Evangelical Justification. Herein [by not Legal] I must not in reason be understood to mean Not in any sence so, or by no Law at all, but not by the Law of works, or as the word Legal is opposed to, or contradistinguished from the word Evangelical. And there cannot be (as I think) a more convincing Argument to prove, That Evangelical in the case, or question in hand, is the fittest name, than by alledging that which will be granted by all, viz. That the Law, by which a sinner is justified, is an Evangelical Law, the Law of the Gospel : For forasmuch as the Law, by which a man was and is to be justified, is two-fold, 1. The Law of God Creator, commonly styled *Lex originalis*, or Law of works ; 2. The Law of God Redeemer, called *Lex remedium*, or the Law of grace or faith ; and forasmuch as the former Law was enacted, as the Rule of justifying an innocent person, and the latter of a sinner, how can we better express the difference betwixt the justification of an innocent and a sinner, than by styling the former a Legal, and the latter an Evangelical Justification ? The peculiar species of the Law, by which a person is justified, is that which doth specificate the justification it self, and is therefore most apt and fit to give it its peculiar denomination.

The Law of works is not the Law, By which, but a Law, From which, (i. e.) by an appeal from which to the Law of grace, a sinner is and is to be justified.

I desire, That the answer here given may the rather be duely weighed and observ'd, because it may serve to rectifie the mistake of a certain learned Author, (perhaps also of some other Brethren) who albeit he doth allow a sinners justification to be Evangelical, *ex parte principii*, (Evangelical Grace

Grace in Christ, being the fountain of it) and so to be called, with a respect thereunto, nevertheless he will not allow it roundly and absolutely to be denominated Evangelical, but rather Legal, for these two reasons: Because it is Legal, *ex parte termini & medii*. 1. *Ex parte termini, because it is minated in the satisfaction, which is to be made or performed to the Law: He hath freed me from the Law of sin and death.*—

To this I answer, What he means here by the satisfaction to be made to the Law, (upon which the justification of a sinner is by him said to be terminated) I do not know, nor will I take upon me so much as to guess, lest I should mistake his meaning; only I will say as followeth, 1. That by *the Law of the Spirit of life*, (*Rom. 8.2.*) is meant the Evangelical Law, the Gospel of Christ, or Law of Faith. 2. That Justification is one part at least of that saving benefit, which the Apostle comprizeth under the expression of his being by that Law, *made free from the Law of sin and death*, it being as well the guilt of sin, as the power of sin, which by that Law he was made free from.

3. Consequently I say, That that Scripture proves not the Author's purpose, but the direct contrary, *viz.* That because it is by the Law of the Gospel, that we are made free, or justified from the guilt of our sins, therefore our Justification is to be called Evangelical, and not Legal.

2. *Respectu medii, in respect of the means* (says he) *which is the Legal Righteousness of Christ, by, or through faith imputed to us.*

To this I answer, 1. As in some respect the Righteousness of Christ may be styled *Justitia Legalis*, (the Law of his Mediatorship requiring it, and it being the rule thereof) so in another respect it may be
tly

fitly said to be *Justitia pro-Legal*, (it being to us instead, or standing us instead of a perfect legal Righteousness) so also in another respect it may very fitly be styled (and so I find it styled by some Authors) our evangelical righteousness; and an evangelical righteousness it may, I say, be very fitly styled, 1. Because the Gospel is it, and it alone (not the light of nature) by which it is revealed and made known to the world. 2. Because it was of Gods grace to appoint it. 3. To accept it also, and this for gracious, or Gospel-ends, viz. the pardon or justification of sinners. And for this reason I may well conclude, That the justification of sinners is to be denominated not a legal (as the Author contends for) but an evangelical Justification.

2. As for his saying, *That this legal Righteousness of Christ is imputed to us by, or through faith*; I answer, 1. It is not at all imputed to us in the sense of this Author, (*i. e.*) properly, and in its essential nature, but only in the saving effects thereof, as I have already (I hope) convincingly demonstrated.

2. Nevertheless I grant, that [in subordination to the Righteousness of Christ] faith is a *Medium*, or means of a sinners justification, though it is another kind of *Medium*, than is Christs Righteousness, to which it is subordinate in the justifying of a sinner; Christs Righteousness being such a *Medium*, as hath the nature or efficiency of a meritorious cause, but our faith having only the nature of a condition simply so called. I have thought meet to intimate this for these two reasons, 1. To prevent the mis-understanding of what I said in the foregoing Chapter, wherein was said, that Gospel-pardon was *ex Christi satisfactione*, and *ex peccatoris*

toris fide, which must not be so understood, as if the word *ex* did imply the self same importance in both places : For the truth is, that as the particle *ex* is of different importance (it importing sometimes one kind of cause, and sometimes another, and sometimes no cause at all, but an antecedent condition, and the same I may say of the particles in English, Greek and Hebrew corresponding to the Latine particle *ex*) so in the former application of the particle, it doth imply efficiency, or an efficient meritorious cause, but in the latter only an antecedent, or a condition, *sine qua non*.

2. To prevent the mis-construction of the word [faith] in many places of Scripture, where, by faith many do understand only its object (Christ, or his Righteousness) whereas, as faith and Christs Righteousness are two things of distinct consideration, so by faith in such sayings as these (*We are justified By faith, and saved By faith—*) we are to understand not only the object thereof as implied (Christ, or his Righteousness) but also the act believing, or the thing it self *faith*.

Lastly, I answer, That forasmuch as God is graciously pleased in his Gospel, to appoint and to declare his acceptance of faith, as the condition of a sinners justification, through, or for the sake of Christs Righteousness, therefore I answer as before, That a sinners justification is to be denominated rather Evangelical, than Legal.

I shall now return to Mr. *Ferguson*, and reply to certain other passages, which I find here and there dispersed in his Book, as grounds for the Imputation of Christs Righteousness to us, in the sense by him contended for.

C H A P. X V.

Several mistakes in Mr. F. according to the obvious construction of his words, detected. That Christ suffered not the Idem, but the Tantundem, manifested by three things, distinctly specified, and two evil consequences of the contrary Doctrine. With a Caution in the close.

P. 536. **M**AN having taken off his dependency Mr. F. upon God, by transgressing the Law of Creation, Gods Rectitude over him, which is regulated by his wisdom, holiness, veracity, and the eternal rectitude and righteousness of his nature, would not allow, that he should be received into favour, but in such a way, and by such means, as may secure the ends of government, manifest the dissimilarity that is in God to sin, evidence his truth and immutability, in proceeding according to the penal Law, which in pursuance of his own Attributes, and mans rational nature and relation, he had at first enacted.

Ans. I assent to the whole of what is here recited, except this, That God did for the ends specified, proceed according to the penal Law, which at first was enacted, in which saying, there is a complication of mistakes involved; for 1. That Law was only dispensed, and not executed, neither upon Christ, nor upon mankind; not upon Christ; for Christ was not at all threatened in that Law, neither did he die the death by virtue of that Law, however by occasion of it, as hath been already

already said. Nor was that Law executed upon all mankind, supposing, (and taking it for granted) that by the death there threatned, is meant eternal as well as temporal death.

The threatnings of God do induce only an obligation upon transgressors to suffer the punishment threatned, but not any necessary obligation upon God to inflict it.

2. A mistake of the nature of that obligation, which a divine commination doth induce, seems to be implied in the said words of this Author ; for *Comminatio est obligatio Legem violentis ad peccatum ferendam, non Legem ferentis ad inferendam* ; that commination did signifie what man was bound to suffer, not what God was bound to do : Upon disobedience man was bound to suffer, but God was not thereupon bound to inflict punishment ; otherwise supream Law-givers could have no power to pardon ; and therefore there is no necessity, that the punishment threatned should be executed, and it is an error to assert, or imagine any such necessity : The only inevitable effect of that threatening was, That upon mans sin punishment should be his due, and so it was ; man being bound to punishment *Ipsò facto*, upon his offence committed. And herein is the difference betwixt a Commination and a Denunciation of punishment, this being an act of judgment or sentence, or else a prediction of a decree to punish, whereupon the punishment denounced is always inflicted.

3. There seems also to be this mistake (a mistake of very evil consequence) implied in the clause fore-cited, *viz.* That Christ suffered the *Idem*, not the *Tantumdem*, the same suffering, to which that Commination did oblige, and that a sinners liberation from the punishment, to which he was obliged, was by the way of strict payment, not satisfaction, or compensation.

4. There seems also to be this mistake implied in the said clause, *viz.* That the ends of Gods sovereign

veraign rule and government, could not be secured by a Compensation, or without strict solution, or payment of that very debt of punishment, which was by the sin of man contracted. And if I were sure, that this Author would own this opinion, (for God forbid, that I should causlessly fasten any thing upon him, or any of my Brethren) viz. That the sufferings of Christ were *Ipsa debiti solutio*, and not *Pro debito satisfactio*, I would more at large suggest somewhat of my own, and endeavour to improve what hath been (so far as my knowledge reacheth) said by others against it. Nevertheless because there are of my Brethren, who do maintain, that Christ suffered the very *Idem*, which was in a sinners obligation, and not the *Tantumdem*, at least that it is not much material, whether we say the one, or the other, I will for their satisfaction, do these two things;

1. I will briefly set down the substance of what is commonly and truly (as I believe) said by the most learned judicious Divines, whose writings I am acquainted with, in this matter.

2. I will suggest two or three things, which I conceive to be the native consequences of Christ his suffering, the *Idem* of our obligation, and not the *Tantumdem*.

For the first be it considered,

1. That the person who made the payment, was not the same who was in the obligation, but another: For it was not Christ, who was in the obligation, but the sinner, the Law threatening not him in person, or him in our person, but the sinner. Briefly, that Law obliged none to die, but the sinner, nor any other to die for or instead of the sinner.

2. The sufferings of Christ were not altogether

Christ's sufferings were not the very payment of our debt in kind, but a valuable satisfaction to divine justice for our not payment of it, or for Gods not exacting of us the payment thereof.

of the same kind. There was that exclusion of sinners from the favour of God, threatned in the curse, and which shall one day be executed upon some sinners, which was not suffered, or undergone by Christ : For as the Apostle says, upon supposal of a perfect similitude betwixt our great High-Priest, and those after the order of Aaron, (Then must Christ often have suffered since the foundation of the world, Heb. 9. 26.) Even so, upon supposition, that whatsoever suffering was threatned to the sinner, was inflicted upon Christ, I may say, Then Jesus Christ should have often suffered since the foundation of the world; yea to the end of the world, yea world without end, even to all eternity. His sufferings (forasmuch as he was both God and man in one person) however they were equivalent to whatsoever was threatned by the original Law to sinners, yet they were not the same.

3. The ground and reason of Christs and sinners obligation to suffer, was not of the same kind, or denomination, his being *Obligatio fidejussoria*, or *Contractus*, but ours *Criminis*, or *ex delicto*, as Christs hath been already said. As sinners were obliged to suffer by one Law, so Christs obligation did result from another, and that Law peculiar to himself.

2. As for the evil consequences of asserting, That Christ suffered the *Idem*, the same thing which was in a sinners obligation to suffer, be it considered, that thence it will follow, That a sinner should *Ipsò facto* have an immediate present right, to be discharged from his obligation to suffer (according to that celebrated saying of the *Civilians*, *Solutione ejus quod debetur, tollitur obligatio*) which to say, is a branch of down-right *Antinomian*

The ground of Christs obligatiō and our obligari. on to suffer is extremely different: for ours was founded upon the guilt of sin committed; but Christs was founded upon his own voluntary sponſion, whence it is, that ours is justly denominated *Obligatio Criminis*, but His only *Contractus*.

Antinomian

sinomian doctrine, which maintains the Justification of Infidels, or of sinners, in their damnable unbelief.

2. It follows, That a sinners discharge from his obligation to suffer, is not truly, and therefore cannot rationally be styled Pardon of sin, or that a sinner (upon such a supposition) cannot rationally be said to be pardoned: For I look upon the sayings of those two learned men (*Grotius* and *Wotton*) as undoubted truths, viz. *Ubi idem solvitur vel à debitore, vel ab alio debitoris nomine, nulla contingit remissio; nihil enim circa debitum agit Creditor, aut Rector. Grot. de satisf. p. 119.* Where the same thing is paid either by the debtor himself, or by any other in his name, there is no remission, or pardon of the debt. The Creditor, or Rector, doth in that case act nothing, he only receives the debt. And says Mr. *Wotton*, *De reconcil. Pecc. p. 157.* *Pana, ac venia diversa sunt, ita planè, ut qui panas dederit, non sit absolutus, qui absolutus est, supplicio affectus non fuit.* Punishment and pardon are contrary (so the word *Diversa* is here to be construed) so as that he, who hath suffered the punishment for his sin, is not pardoned, or absolved, and he who is absolved (i.e.) absolved by a pardon, was not punished.

My reply to what this Author says in the next Page, shall be the subject of the following Chapter.

Only lest I should seem willing (which is indeed a thing far from me) to charge this Author, with the holding of any point of doctrine, which he doth dis-own, I think it meet at the close of this Chapter, to give the Reader to understand, that he doth else-where in effect say, That Christ did not suffer the *Idem*, but the *Tantundem*; for

he says expressly, p.557. *That Christ submitted to the demerit of our sins, so as to undergo the penalty in the substance and kind of it (though not in the adjuncts, and consequential accidents, which would have accompanied it upon such weak, finite, depraved subjects as we are) that we should have undergone.*

Hereupon all that I can peremptorily say is this, viz.

1. That I am not able to reconcile this Author with himself in both his said sayings : For if Christ did undergo the penalty of the Law, which we should have undergone only in the substance, and not in the circumstances thereof, as here specified, how was it true to say as he said in Page 536. *That in Christs suffering for our sins, God did evidence his truth and immutability, in proceeding according to the Penal Law, which in pursuance of his own Attributes, and mans rational Nature and relations to God, he had at first enacted ?* For was not the circumstances, adjuncts, or accidents of punishment, as well as the substance of punishment, threatned to man in that penal Law, and which man having sin'd, should accordingly have undergone ? Now if Christ did undergo the penalty only in the substance, but not in the adjuncts threatned, how is this consistent with his saying, *That in the sufferings of Christ, God did proceed according to the penal Law, which at first was enacted ?*

2. It is not reconcileable to, but flatly against the truth to say, That Christ suffered that punishment in kind, which we should have undergone : For I would demand of him, Was not eternal death comprized in the penalty threat-

threatned in that Law at first enacted ?

3. If by Gods truth and immutability, Mr. F. means (as it is evident, he doth) the immutability and truth of God, in fulfilling that his threatning-word, *Gen. 2. 17.* it is his notorious mistake so to think, or say : For that penal Law was not by the sufferings of Christ fulfilled, or executed, but through a compensation, or through his compensatory sufferings dispenced with, as was upon occasion before said, God therein manifesting his mercy and justice, but not his truth and immutability, respectively to that threatning-Law.

C H A P. X V I.

The Imputation of Socinianism groundlessly charged by Mr. F. upon his Brethren. Mr. F. his charging his Antagonists with nonsense, refuted. That sort of union with Christ to be renounced, the native consequence whereof is the reciprocal Imputation of our sins to Christ, and of his Righteousness to us, in the sence of Mr. F. with his Adherents (i.e.) properly and formally, or otherwise than in the fruits and effects of the one, and of the other. The reason thereof rendred.

P. 537. **T**O say, That Christ suffered only for our Mr. F. advantage, and not in our room, is plain

F. 2

Soci

Socinianism ; and to say, That he bare our punishment, without being charged with our guilt, is plain non-sence ; and yet to remonstrate to such a Relation between him and us, as may and ought to be styled a Legal Union, is to vent repugnancies in the same breath.

Ans. What is here said, hath in effect already been answered ; and to the same purpose I say again ;

1. The imputation of *Socinianism* is causeless, forasmuch as we do acknowledg what they deny, viz. That Jesus Christ being God and man in one person, did make a satisfaction, or compensation to Gods justice, and by his doings and sufferings did merit the pardon of our sins.

2. We deny not, but that Jesus Christ may be truly said to have suffered in our room or stead, (and for that cause to be styled in the word of one of the Ancients our *Αντὶς*) because he suffered that which was equivalent to the suffering, which being due to us we should have suffered, and thereby to save us from suffering ; and we say, That Christ suffered in the person of a Mediator, to procure our pardon and reconciliation with God. Only we do deny, That Christ was in such a sence our *Αντὶς*, or that he did in such a strict sence die in our room and stead, as that he may be said to die *in nostrâ personâ*, in such sort representing our persons, as that we can truly be said to have satisfied in and by him, or that his sufferings are in their essential nature imputed to us. One King may be said to rule *ἀντὶ*, in the room of another, though he may not therefore be said to be the Representative of that other, as *Archelaus* is said to have reigned *ἀντὶ πατρός*, in the room of his Father *Herod*, *Solomon* in the room of *David*, 1 King.

5.5. *Benaiah* to be made Captain-General of the Host, in the room of *Joab*, 1 King. 2. 35. and *Elisha* to be substituted or anointed a Prophet, in the room of *Elijah*, 1 King. 19. 16. although none of these can be truly said in a strict sence to represent the persons of those, in whose room they were substituted.

3. If by Our punishment this Author meaneth the *Idem*, the self same punishment, which we should have born, it hath been already gainsaid, and the contrary truth proved, as also that he did not bear our guilt, neither our guilt of fact, or fault at all, nor the self same guilt or obligation to punishment as was ours, but another kind of obligation, that was peculiar to himself.

4. What non-sence soever there is in saying, That Christ bare *Idem supplicium*, our very punishment, without being charged with our guilt, nevertheless it is true sence, and the sence of Scripture to say, That Christ did contract, or take upon him an obligation to suffer, and did actually undergo such sufferings, as were equivalent to that punishment which we deserved to suffer, and this without being charged with our guilt.

5. The things being justly to be denied, which he doth here presume as granted, or to be granted, (*viz.* That Christ did at all take upon him our *Reatus facti*, or *culpa*, our guilt of fact, or fault, or the self same guilt, or obligation to punishment, which was ours) it follows, That there is all the reason in the world, to remonstrate unto any such union of Christians with Christ (by what name soever dignified or distinguished, Mystical, Conjugal, Political, Legal, Evangelical, Supernatural —) the native consequence whereof is, That Christ was charged with our guilt of sin, That he

took upon him the self same obligation to punishment, which, was ours, That our sin really in it self was imputed to him, and undergone by him, and That his doings and sufferings (briefly) his Righteousness, was formally in it self imputed unto us. All these Consequents are justly to be remonstrated against, and consequently so are all the Antecedents (be they never so specious) from whence they do naturally and necessarily result, or flow, for (as the common saying is) *Ex vero nihil nisi verum*, From truth nothing but truth doth natively and necessarily issue. These things considered, it is easie to answer his arguings in p.556,557. which I shall more at large now recite and reply to.

C H A P. X V I I.

That Christ may very well be said to be made sin for us, to bear our sins, to die for our offences—although it cannot be truly said, that he did bear our sin it self, or sin in it self, or otherwise than in the fruit and effects of it, the contrary whereunto is pretended by Mr. F. Mr. Ferguson's mistake in confounding an Antecedent impulsive cause, with a meritorious cause, the difference whereof is asserted and exemplified. His mistake in not distinguishing betwixt An obligation, and Our obligation to suffer. That though our sins did properly merit Christs suffering, nevertheless it will not follow from thence, that Christ himself did merit it, or took upon him the meriting thereof. That Christ may be said in an improper sence to be punished. The word [Demerit of punishment] ambiguous, a two-fold sence whereof is specified. The Arguments which overthrow the Popish doctrine of believers, being discharged from the guilt of sin, but not the punishment, altogether mis-applied by Mr. F. to the point in hand.

P.556,557. **H**AD not the susception of our sins Mr. F., preceded, as the antecedent impulsive cause of Christs sufferings, be could neither be said

said to be made sin for us, nor to bear them, nor to have them laid upon him, nor to die for our offences, nor to be our ransom : Nor could the inflicting of sufferings upon him have been either good in it self, or an act of Rectoral justice in God, or have had any tendency to his glory, or to the honour of his Law, or to deter sinners from offending ; yes, preclude once the consideration of sin, as the meritorious cause of the Agonies which Christ underwent, and the love, wisdom, justice, and Rectorship of God, are obnoxious to reflections, and stand liable to be impeached. And if it be once obtained, that our sins are the meritorious impulsive cause of Christs death, his susception of our guilt will necessarily follow. For guilt being nothing but an obligation to punishment, and it being impossible to conceive such a habitude betwixt a person and sin, that it should be the meritorious impulsive cause of his punishment, and yet he not be under an obligation to punishment, it plainly follows, that guilt must be supposed antecedent to a demerit of punishment. Guilt and punishment being Relates, be that is obnoxious to the latter, must be previously under the Imputation of the former, as Bishop Andrews expresseth it, Christ was first made sin in respect of the guilt, and then a curse in respect of the punishment. Serm. of Justification on Jer.23.6.

Ans. Almost all of this, either in the same words, or in words to the same effect, hath been before recited out of this Author, and a reply accordingly shaped thereunto. And for that reason, it is necessary only to repeat the Answers, which have been already given. I answer then,

1. Christ may very well be said to be made sin for us, to bear our sins, to have them laid upon him, to die for our offences, and to be our ransom, in that he did take upon him an obligation to suffer,

suffer, and suffer to death for the expiation of them, although it cannot be truly said, That Christ did bear our sin it self [properly and formally taken] but only in the fruit and sad consequences of it, viz. suffering equivalent punishment, to that which was due to us for it.

2. As to the Authors expressions [Antecedent Impulsive Cause]

1. It is the Authors mistake, to confound an Antecedent Impulsive Cause with a Cause Meritorious. That he doth so, is most apparent and undeniable by his fore-cited words. But that it is his mistake so to do, be it considered,

1. That the misery of an indigent Creature, may be well said to be an antecedent impulsive cause of that compassion, which is shewed towards it by those, who are conscious unto, or spectators of its misery. And accordingly I doubt not to aver, That the miserable effects of sin, specially in making us obnoxious to the vengeance of eternal fire, was an antecedent impulsive cause, moving God, (speaking of him after the manner of men, which we must do, or else we can scarce say any thing of him) fore-ordain the sufferings of our Lord Redeemer Christ Jesus, whereby to rescue us out of our wretched, and otherwise forlorn condition. Yet who will, or can justly say, That the misery of a Creature, doth in a strict or proper sence merit the pity, whether of God or man ? This if it did, pity would scarce deserve the name of pity, I mean, it would not be so thank-worthy, forasmuch as that which is merited, deserves little, if any thanks. Is a Labourer obliged to give his Master thanks for his wages, which he hath earned, or merited ? Misery may be well said to be *Res apta nata*; an object naturally fit to move mer-

cy, or to be an impelling cause thereunto, and yet not a Meritorious cause thereof, in the strict and proper usual sence of the word Meritorious.

2. Though I grant it as a truth, and a fit saying, That our misery contracted by sin, was an antecedent impulsive cause of Gods mercy, in delivering up Christ for us all, nevertheless I do utterly deny, that our sins were the Meritorious cause of Christs death, or sufferings. I grant, that our sins were the Occasion of Christs sufferings, but I deny, that our sins did merit his sufferings. And I have just and great cause so to do, forasmuch as our Logick tells us, that there is a great difference betwixt an Occasion and a Cause (truly so called) as this Author cannot but know very well. I remember the saying of *David* to *Abiathar*, 1 Sam. 22. 22. *I have occasioned the death of all the persons of thy fathers house*; which notwithstanding it could not be said, That he had caused their death. In like sort may we say to God, We have occasioned thee to bruise the Son of thy love, and to put him to grief, we have been the occasion of all his sufferings; but we may not say, That our sins did merit them.

3. Forasmuch as what this Author hath sought, he cannot obtain, viz. an acknowledgment, That our sins were the meritorious cause of Christs death; and forasmuch as he makes this the ground of his following inferences, it is not therefore needful, that I should use many words in replying thereunto: For if the foundation of a building be removed, the superstructure falls of it self, and without hands. Nevertheless I add,

3. Although I do deny, that our sins were the meritorious cause of Christs sufferings, nevertheless I do assert, that Christ was under An obligation to suffer for our sins. It is this Authors great mistake,

mistake, not to distinguish in this contest, betwixt Christs obligation and Ours, whereas, as hath been aforesaid, these are two obligations specifically different; and all his inferences here are utterly groundless, *e. g.*

1. That Christ could not suffer, or be under An obligation to suffer, except he had been under, or had taken upon him, Our obligation to suffering.

2. That he could not else have been said to bear our sins, to be made sin for us, to have our sins laid upon him, to die for them, nor to be our ransom.

3. That without this, the inflicting of sufferings upon Christ, could not have been either good in it self, or an act of Rectoral justice in God, or have had any tendency to his glory, or—All these inferences, I say, are altogether groundless.

4. I answer *Ex abundanti*, If our sins could properly be said to have merited Christs sufferings, nevertheless it will not from thence follow, That we meriting, that he should suffer, then he himself did merit it, or took upon him the meriting thereof; and therefore although guilt, as he says, must be supposed antecedent to a demerit of punishment, yet where there is no such demerit (as in Christ there was not) there 'tis not necessary to suppose any antecedent guilt: Nor indeed in any case, but where the person suffering is properly punish'd, which Christ was not, but only a sufferer of that, which we for our sins deserved to have suffered in our own persons, and which if we had personally suffered, it would have been formally and properly a punishment to us; but was not to him, because he never deserved it, nor was any such

such guilt, or deserving it imputed to him, or taken upon him. And yet he may be said in some improper sence, to be obliged to punishment; I do not mean the word [improperly] in reference to Obligated (for Christs obligation to suffering, however it was not at all *Obligatio Criminis*, yet being truly *Obligatio Contractus*, it was therefore *In suo genere*, a proper obligation) but to the word [Punishment] and I do therefore express the matter now plainly, and say, That Christ may be said to be obliged to punishment improperly so called, because he did voluntarily undertake, and obliged himself to suffer those pains, which being inflicted on us, would have been properly, or proper punishments.

5. As for the testimony of that renowned Bishop *Andrews*, I have made reply thereunto in an entire Chapter (*Cb. 5.*) and I have thought it my part the rather so to do, because, as I perceive by my late reading, not Mr. *Ferguson* only, but certain other Brethren, by their allegation of that saying of the Bishop, have adopted it as their own.

There is but one passage more, which I have observed in my reading of his Book throughout, to refer to the matter in hand (The Imputation of Christs Righteousness to us, or our guilt to him) which because it will not need any large reply, I will not assign a peculiar Chapter thereunto, but shall therewith close both this Chapter, as also the whole of what I have here to animadvert upon, with reference to him.

Mr. F.

P. 557. *Where sin is so charged, as to expose a person to a demerit of punishment, there is an obligation to it, and where there is such an obligation to it, there is in some sence or other, guilt. Those very*
Argu-

Arguments, whereby we overthrow the Popish Dogm of Believers, being discharged from the guils of sin, but not the punishment, do equally disprove Christs undergoing the punishment of sin, without susception of the guils.

Ans. 1. The word [demerit of punishment] is ambiguous; for it may signifie two things, viz. Either the meriting of punishment, or punishment it self merited; in the latter sence it's true, That our sin was so charged upon Christ, as occasionally to expose him to demerit of punishment (*i. e.*) to suffer the punishment, which was the demerit of our sin, or which we by our sin had merited; but in the former sence it is a notorious untruth to say, That our sin was so charged upon Christ, as to expose him to the demerit of punishment (*i. e.*) That he was charged with the meriting of any punishment.

2. Thence it follows, That although there was an obligation upon Christ to suffer, yet not our obligation, nor any such obligation as was ours, but an obligation of a different kind from ours, as hath severall times upon occasion been said before.

3. The Author speaks at random, and not to the purpose in hand, in that his inference, saying, There is in some sence or other, guilt: For as there are divers senses of the word [Guilt] yea divers kinds of Guilt [Guilt of fault, and Guilt of, or obligation to punishment] so the Question in hand is not, Whether Christ did not take upon him Guilt in some sence or other, nor whether he took upon him An obligation to punishment, but whether he took upon him that kind of Guilt at all, which is called Guilt of fact, or fault (*i. e.*) our deserving to suffer, or due obligation to suffer what we by our sin had deserved.

4. I conceive, That the Popish doctrine here

reflected on is this, *viz.* That Believers are discharged from the guilt of sin, as to eternal punishment, by the satisfaction of Christ, yet not as to temporal punishments, but by satisfaction made by themselves; but whatever the Popish doctrine be in this matter, I do utterly deny, that those very Arguments, whereby we do overthrow that, or any other *Dogmata* of the Papists, do at all disprove, what I my self with other of my Brethren, do in this contest, assert, *viz.* That Christ did undergo an obligation, to suffer the punishment, which we deserved for our sins, without any undergoing, or taking upon him our guilt, or deserving thereof. And as to the distinction of *Remissio culpe* and *pæne*, and also as to the common saying, *Sublatâ culpâ tollitur pæna*, I have twenty years ago plainly spoken my thoughts, in the 10th. and 11th. Chapters of my Exercitation, concerning the Nature of forgiveness of sin, and I am still of the same mind, as I have there expressed it in opposition to the Papists (that I may not say also in way of dissent from some of our own) *viz.* That there is no such thing as *Remissio culpe* [Remission of fault] in way of distinction from *Remissio pæne* [Remission of the punishment] these two being one, and the self same thing.

These are all the passages, relating to the reciprocal Imputation of Christs Righteousness unto us, and of our sins to him, which I have to reply unto, upon a due consideration whereof, I submit to the judgment of the learned and impartial Reader, whether it may not be truly said of this Author, in those words of *Elibu*, Job 35. 16. That [as to the foresaid matters in debate] *he hath multiplyed words with u: knowledg (i.e.)* the right knowledg of the nature of the things, he undertook to treat of.

CHAP. XVIII.

Reflections upon certain passages in Dr. J. Owen's Book styled (Communion with God) concerning Christ his being made ruddy in his own blood, Morally by the Imputation of sin ; and concerning that blessed Bartering and Exchange pretended by him, betwixt Believers giving up their sins to Christ, and their taking from him that Righteousness, which he wrought for them. His obscure, ambiguous, un-Scriptural phrases reprov'd, and his mistakes therein (according to obvious construction) detected. An Objection answered, wherein a two-fold Taking or Receiving of a thing is specified, and apply'd to the purpose in hand. His mistake in affirming, that the Saints by giving up their sins to Christ, and taking from him his Righteousness, do fulfil the whole of that in 2 Cor. 5.21. The falshood of the reason asserted by the Doctor, why those, who said, Lord, Lord, were disappointed in their expectation, instead whereof, the true reason or reasons are assigned. That for sinners to plead their repentance and duties, is not to barter with themselves only, to take Christs work out of his hand, and to ascribe it to other things, or to say, their duties shall bear their iniquities (according as the Dr. misconstitutes

G

the

the matter) but it is in very deed and in true construction, to put the work of their being actually saved, into the hand of Christ, and to keep it there. The manner of a sinners Bartering with Christ laid open, if it may fitly be so styled.

MY work in the remainder of this Treatise, will be for the most part in answering of such needful Questions, as are (so many as at present I can call to mind) incident to the subject in hand, which shall be distinctly proposed and handled in the ensuing Chapters. Only I shall desire the Reader to take notice (now I have in a manner parted from Mr. F.) that what I have replied to him, touching the Reciprocal Non-imputation of our sin to Christ, and of Christs Righteousness to us, in their formal and essential nature, or otherwise than in the cursed and blessed effects of the one and of the other, is alike subservient for the refutation of several passages of Dr. J. Owen, (a partaker with Mr. F. in several mistakes, and misinterpretations of the sacred Scriptures, as will be manifested in certain Chapters, towards the close of this Treatise) in his Book styled, *Communion with God*, some whereof I will here relate, and reply to.

P.53. *Christ was made ruddy (says the Doctor) in his own blood two ways, 1. Naturally, in the pouring out of his blood, Luk.22. 24. Joh.19. 34. 2. Morally, by the Imputation of sin, whose colour is red and crimson, 2 Cor.5.21.*

P.221. *The Saints make an Actual commutation with the Lord Jesus, as to their sins and his Righteousness.*

Having said, p. 222. That they do lay down their sins at the cross of Christ, upon his shoulders, he proceeds to express this Commuting of Believers, their sins with Christ, and his Righteousness with them, in the following words, p. 223.

Having thus by faith given up their sins to Christ, and seen God laying them all on him, they draw nigh; and take from him that Righteousness, which he hath wrought out for them: So fulfilling the whole of that of the Apostle, 2 Cor. 5. 21. He was made sin for us, that we might become the Righteousness of God in him. They consider him tending himself and his Righteousness, to be their Righteousness before God; they take it, and accept of it, and compleat this blessed bartering and exchange of faith. Anger, curse, wrath, death, sin as to its guilt, he took it all, and takes it all away—

Ans. As to one of the passages here recited, I need not say much more, than what hath been already said in answer to Mr. F. wherein I have manifested what manner of guilt our Saviour took upon him. I will only say further, That I have with a complication of affections (grief and sadness, with a mixture also of some indignation and abhorrency) taken notice of three or four things in his express words.

1. I observe, That in his asserting, that Christ was made red in his own blood, Morally by the Imputation of sin, whose colour is red and crimson, he seems to say with Mr. F. that Christ did take our sin upon him not only in the punishment, but also in the guilt thereof. This, I say, seems to be his meaning.

1. Because the hainous nature or guilt of sin. is set forth in Scripture by the Metaphor here used by him, of redness, like to that of crimson or scarlet,

2. Because he says expressly, not only that Christ took upon him Anger, Curse, Wrath, Death, but sin also as to its guilt; in which words, he makes the guilt of sin a distinct thing from the punishment of it, which he expresseth in the four preceding words [Anger, Curse, Wrath, and Death.] Now the contrary truth to this his meaning (if indeed he did mean as he spake) I have already made known in my answer to Mr. F. and to the words of Bissop *Andrews*, Ch. 5.

2. I observe his canting phrases (laying down our sins at the cross of Christ, upon his shoulders, Commuting, Exchanging, Bartering, By faith Giving up our sins to Christ, and Taking from him his Righteousness) language obscure, ambiguous, most alien from the Scripture, more fit to delude, than to edifie any common Reader or Hearer. And if any partial or less intelligent person, shall be offended with the word (Canting) as in his apprehension *Durus Sermo*, a censure too harsh, I will for his satisfaction say as followeth :

1. As for the Doctor's expression (The Saints giving up their sins to Christ by faith, Laying down their sins at his cross, upon his shoulders) I know no such sayings in Scripture; and I do therefore judg them fit to be rejected, with words like those of the Apostle in another case, *The holy Scriptures have no such custom of speaking, nor the Churches of God*, 1 Cor. 11. 16. And I do judg thus the rather, because the inspired Scriptures were given of God, to be attended unto as the rule of our speaking, in and about the concernments of our soul, and matters of Religion, as well as of our thinking.

2. A bad meaning of the phrases is very obvious to any common understanding, That Christ

did and will own our sins in the simple guilt thereof, or that our guilt of sin was imputed to him by God, and being thus tendered to Christ, laid by us at his cross, on his shoulders, will be welcomed and accepted by him as an acceptable offering, or as a grateful present; in which fond imagination we do wrong God and Christ, and do out of measure flatter our selves, as hath been already manifested.

3. The best construction, which I can (according to the utmost of my understanding) make, of the said phrases, is, That the Saints do verily believe, that Christ did bear their sins in the deserved punishment thereof. And if the Doctor's meaning was no more than this, I answer,

1. We may believe this as an undoubted truth, and yet not be Saints. An historical faith (as it's usually styled) is not therefore necessarily a sanctifying or saving faith.

2. It was God himself, who did antecedently to our believing lay our sins upon Christ (*i.e.*) in his suffering for them; but we do no where read in Scripture, that the Saints by their faith do lay their sins upon him, although it is most true, that every sinner ought to make a penitential confession of his sin to God, with faith in Christ, who was sacrificed for them.

3. The said true construction (if that indeed was the Doctor's meaning) is a thing so latent in his said expressions, that without an Interpreter, could scarcely be found out. So that upon the hearing of such uncouth phrases, from the mouth of any Minister, well may the Auditors sigh, saying in allusion to that in *Ezek. 20. last.* *Ab Lord God, dost not the Preacher speak Parables?*

2. As for the Doctor's other expressions (*The*

Saints their taking from Christ that Righteousness, which he hath wrought out for them, and his tending it to them, to be their Righteousness before God) I say of them much-what as I did of the former, viz.

1. I do not remember any such express sayings in Scripture, and I cannot therefore approve them as agreeable to the form of wholesome words.

2. I see no reason, upon which in charity to presume, that the Doctor had any good meaning in the said phrases (*i. e.*) that his *particular* meaning therein (for I judge him not for want of a good meaning in general, which a man may have both in speaking falsely and doing wickedly, *Job. 16. 2.*) was sound and good: For it appears by the current of his Book, That he would have sinners to believe, that that very Righteousness, which Christ wrought for them, is in it *self* tended to them, and taken by them, and that it is in its essential nature imputed to them, and is their Righteousness before God. I shall to this purpose in this place, transcribe onely one passage out of his Book, p. 200.

Christ, says he, tenders his Righteousness to sinners, declares the usefulness and preciousness thereof to their souls, stirs them up to a desire and valuation of it, and lastly, effectually bestows it on them, reckoning it to them as theirs, that they should by it, and For it, and With it, be perfectly accepted with the Father.

Scarce any thing can be more plainly spoken, as well in this, as in other passages of his Book (hereafter to be mentioned) from whence to conclude, That he asserts Christs Righteousness it self, or in it self, to be imputed to sinners, and that with the

Impu-

Imputation of the very thing it self, they are justified or accepted with God; the error of which imagination I have already discovered, and shall speak somewhat more of in *Ch. 35.* wherein I will manifest, that although figuratively (*i. e.*) in a causal sence, Christs Righteousness is a sinners Righteousness before God, nevertheless (to speak properly) a sinners personal Righteousness, which consists in his sanctification and Remission of sin, is his Righteousness before God. In the mean while, I shall assert this to be the plain truth of Scripture in this matter (even as in effect hath been before asserted by me upon occasion) *viz.* That believing sinners are justified before God, and accepted with him, By and For the Righteousness of Christ, as the meritorious cause thereof, but not With the Imputation of the thing it self, or With the Righteousness of Christ in it self imputed to them.

3. The best and only true construction, that I can possibly make of the said un-Scriptural phrases, is this, *viz.* That the Saints do take from Christ his Righteousness, or the Righteousness he wrought out for them, in the saving fruits or effects thereof; in which sence a like phrase is used, and was before upon occasion instanc't in 2 *Job. 8.* where, by the things which Believers had wrought, are not meant the very things themselves, but the *fruit* or *reward* of them. But upon supposition of this true sence of the said phrase or phrases, I must say,

1. That the Doctor and his Adherents, in this controversie, concerning the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, will not own, or content themselves, with the bare truth of that construction.

Pardon of sin in the blood of Christ being in truth a Righteousness in its kind, Believers may with it boldly and confidently make their appearance before the Judgment seat of Christ. A Malefactor with the Kings pardon in his hand may boldly look his Judg. in the face.

2. Were the said construction the Doctor's true meaning, nevertheless I must needs say, That his exprellion thereof is very un-scriptural, and upon that account, not such as becomes the Oracles of God : For it is not the manner of those divine Oracles to say, That Believers do by faith take Christs Righteousness, in the saving fruit or effect of it, but that the blessed effect thereof Comes upon them ; for which see *Rom. 5. 18. As by the offence of one, judgment Came upon all men to condemnation, so by the Righteousness of One, the free gift Came upon all men to the justification of life ;* and *Rom. 4. 9. Cometh this Blessedness upon the Circumcision only, or —*

Obj. 1 *Pet. 1. 9. Believers being there said to receive the end or reward (for so the word ῥαῖς signifies, viz. both end and reward) of their faith, is not that all one, as to take it in the Doctor's sense of the phrase here used by him ?*

¶ *Answerably to the Hebrew word (gnekeb) which signifies the like, as appears by Ps. 119. 33 and 19. 11 in the former place it signifies an End, in the latter a Reward.* *Answer.* No : For there is a two-fold taking or receiving of a thing, viz. Ethical and Physical, or Active and Passive, as it may be fitly expressed ; the former implies our duty, and is a taking or laying hold of a thing, by an act of faith or believing, in which sense it's taken in the Doctor's phrase or exprellion ; the latter imports our felicity, and doth only imply our Having, Enjoying, or our being partakers of the thing, which we are said to receive, in which Physical or Passive sense it's taken in 1 *Pet. 1. 9.* and in which sense of the word (Receive) we are said to Receive evil as well as good at Gods hand, *Job. 2. 10.* and *Rom. 1. 27. Receiving in themselves that recompence of their error, which was meet.* And the word is applied to things as well as persons, *Heb. 2. 2. (Every transgression Received a just recompence of reward)* unless

unless by sins there we understand sinners, *Every Transgression (i. e.)* every Transgressor received—the abstract being put for the concrete, a thing in Scripture not unusual, as circumcision for circumcised; the same word also being used in the same sense (Transgressions for Transgressors, as some think, *Heb. 9. 15.*)

Briefly, In such a sense as Believers are said to Receive a Kingdom, which cannot be shaken, *Heb. 12. 28.* they may truly be said to Receive Christs Righteousness (*i. e.*) to receive it in the benefit or fruit thereof; which fruit in the final upshot, is indeed the Kingdom it self there spoken of, and by which reception, is not there meant a Moral or Active Reception by the hand of faith, or action of believing (for it is not there commanded as a duty) but a Passive Reception (it being there mentioned as the blessed fruit of a divine promise) or Having it, as is the Apostles word, *Rom. 6. 22.* *You Have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life;* and *Mat. 19. 27.* *What shall we Have therefore?* To which our Saviour answers, *v. 29.* *You shall Receive an hundred-fold.*—

3. The third thing, which I observe in the Doctor's words, is his Vanity, in calling the said Commuting with Christ (their sins with him, and his Righteousness with them) A Blessed Bartering and Exchange: For Jesus Christ doth not like, nor did he ever make offer of such a bartering or exchange, as seems here to be intended by the Doctor (*i. e.*) Christs taking to himself not only the punishment, but also the guilt of our sins, and [in the way of exchange] our taking from Christ his Righteousness it self. This I have already manifested; so that although the Doctor hath in Gods name blessed such a Bartering, Commuting, Exchang-

changing, nevertheless I may truly say, That sinners do no better than cheat themselves, by such vain imaginations and fancyful conceits. Whereupon that admonition of the Apostle (*Gal. 6.7.*) is in this case to be minded, *Be not deceived, God is not mocked.* Though in commuting, exchanging, bartering commodities one with another, we may deceive and be deceived one by another, yea although in the barter and exchange here spoken of, we may cozen and deceive our selves, yet God and Christ will not be so mocked or deceiv'd. Nevertheless I do acknowledg, that there is a kind of giving and receiving betwixt Christ and a sinner, which if any one list to call Bartering, may well and warrantably be styled A *Blessed* Bartering, and what this kind of Bartering is, I will declare in my reply to another passage of the Doctor's, by and by to be recited, after I have intimated one thing more in his words fore-cited, wherein

4. I observe his mistakes in saying, That by the said Bartering, Believers do fulfil the whole of that of the Apostle, *2 Cor. 5.21.* For

1. The Apostle by those expressions doth not mean such a Commutation, Exchange, or Bartering, as aforesaid, and it is a perverting of that Text, to affix such a sence thereunto, as the Doctor doth.

2. It is not true to say, That Believers by ought, that is, or can be done by them, do fulfil the whole of that Scripture; for it is God, who made Christ, and Christ, who made himself to be sin for us, and this also antecedently to our believing; it is not Believers, who made him to be sin for themselves, or for any others. Yea, as the Apostle said in another case, *2 Tim. 2.13.* (*If we believe not, yet he abideth faithful; he cannot deny himself*) in like sort

sort may it here be truly said, Although sinners believe not, yet God ever was, and still abideth faithful to fulfil, or verifie the whole of that of the Apostle, saying (*God made him to be sin for us, That we might be made—*) together with that in *Job. 3. 16.* and other the like sayings in Scripture, [*God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life.*] Our unbelief (as the Apostle says elsewhere, *Rom. 3. 3.*) cannot make the faith of God without effect (*i. e.*) cannot hinder the fulfilling of his Word.

The Doctor having pronounced the said Commutation, to be a *blessed Bartering and Exchange*, proceeds to tell us, how much Jesus Christ is therewith honoured, saying in the same Page,

Many indeed cry, Lord, Lord, and make mention of him, but honour him not at all. How so? They take his work out of his hand, and ascribe it unto other things; their repentance, their duties, shall bear their iniquities. They do not say so, they do so. The Commutation they make, if they make any, it is with themselves. All their Bartering about sin, is in and with their own souls. The work that Christ came to do in the world, was to bear our iniquities, and lay down his life a ransom for our sins.

1. Although it be very true (and a sad truth it is) that many do cry, Lord, Lord, and do not honour him at all (yea do dishonour him in so saying) yet it is no less false to say, as the Doctor hath here said in his answer to the Question, *How so?* For the reason is not, as he says, Because they take Christs work out of his hand, and ascribe it to other things, their repentance, and duties; but the true reason or reasons thereof are such as these:

1. Be-

1. Because perhaps they did never rightly understand the work, which Christ did put into their hand (*i. e.*) which he did impose upon them, in order to their enjoyment of salvation, through his sufferings, and blood-shed. It is thus with too many, who do deceive themselves in thinking, that a form of godliness will sufficiently serve for that end, although they deny the power thereof.

2. Because if they do know the work put into their hands, or imposed upon them for that end, yet they will not do it (*i. e.*) they will not so believe, as to repent and convert, that they may be saved.

3. Consequently, because they do ascribe that to a form of godliness, or to the bare profession of Christianity, which through the mercy of God in Christ, is promised only to the power and practice of Christian Religion. The truth of what I have herein answered to the said Question (How so?) and the falshood of the Doctor's answer thereunto, is apparent by that very Scripture in *Mat. 7.21.*—

1. It is evidently false, that those vain and empty Professors, did commute only with themselves, and would have no bartering with Christ; for that they would fain have commuted with Christ, is apparent by their closing and scraping acquaintance with him, saying, *Lord, Lord,* or (to speak in the Doctor's phrase) by *laying down their sins at his cross, upon his shoulders, who had born their iniquities.* These words uttered by their own mouths (*Lord, Lord*) do audibly speak their presuming upon Christ to save them, or their making account, that Christ would barter with them.

2. The truth of the reason or reasons, as before

fore specified by me, is most apparent also: For they did not repent, according as was their duty to have done, but they did continue to be workers of iniquity, as our Saviour tells them to their faces, v.23. and upon that account he bad them depart from him, not upon any such account as the Doctor would have it, As if they would take Christs work out of his hands, and ascribe it to their repentance (which was impossible for them to do, who did not repent, except through self-deceit, in thinking they were penitent, whereas indeed they were not) and would have no bartering with him, but with their own duties. So that if we will believe our Saviour Christ, we cannot believe what the Doctor hath said, in answer to the said Question (How so?)

2. If those carnal Professors had indeed repented, and converted from their iniquities, They might well and warrantably have pleaded their repentance and conversion, as a title (through the mercy of God in Christ) for their admittance into the Kingdom of Heaven, saying, *Lord, Lord, open unto us*; instead of saying (*Hast not thou taught in our street, have not we eaten and drunk in thy presence, in thy name cast out devils---*) they had been able to say with David, *I have kept thy Word, I have been upright before thee, and have kept my self from mine iniquity*, or as Hezekiah, or Nebemiah, or St. Paul said of themselves, 2 King. 20. 3. Neb. 14. 22. 2 Tim. 4. 7. Christ would not doubtless have turn'd them going with that cutting word (Depart from me) but have said for their comfort, as to the good servant, *Well done good and faithful servants*: For thus to have pleaded, was not to take any work proper to Christ, out of Christs hand, or to ascribe ought, that was peculiar

culiar to Christ, to any other thing; which to have done, was far from those Old Testament and New Testament Saints before-named. Did David in that saying (*Lord save me; for I am holy*, Ps. 86.2.) renounce all *bartering* with Christ, or take the work of his salvation out of Christs hands, or ascribe that to his own personal holiness, that was peculiar to the person of Christ? I trow not. Yea, for professed Christians in such sort to plead as aforesaid, is in very deed to put the work of their salvation into the hands of Christ, who as he did by bearing their iniquities, purchase their being saved, conditionally upon their return to God through him, by faith and repentance, so he gives repentance to sinners, that thereupon both he and they may be in a proximate, or moral capacity, he of pardoning and saving them, and they of being pardoned or saved by him. Briefly then, the sin and folly of those carnal Professors was not, that they would not at all, or upon any terms Barter with Christ (only with themselves) but that they would have bartered with Christ, with coyn not currant, or with counterfeite ware (*i. e.*) not with true repentance for sin in the name of Christ, and conversion from it, but with an outside profession of Christianity, owning Christ professedly as their Lord and Master, themselves in the mean time being servants to, or workers of iniquity: For had they indeed parted from their sins, they had never parted from Christ, nor would Christ have refused commuting with them, but would have given them the benefit of his Righteousness, in exchange for their parting with their own unrighteousness. And because as our Saviour speaking concerning the *worshipping of God in Spirit and in truth*, says (*The Father seeketh such to worship*

him) so Christ himself seeketh such Chapmen, as will forsake all their sinful ways, that so they may win him, and the benefit of his Righteousness; I will therefore speak a few words, whereby to drive the bargain betwixt the Saviour and the sinner; to which end my advice to every sinner, is as followeth:

1. If ever you mean to drive a saving bargain with Christ, or by bartering with him, gain the benefit of his Righteousness, you must know the market-rate, or (to speak in the language of Scripture, *Luke 14. 28.*) *You must sit down, and count the cost.* And in the name of the living God, I beseech you to take heed of thinking, That it is enough for you to lay down your sins at the cross of Christ, upon his shoulders, or to give up your sins to Christ in the guilt of them, which some use to call, An applying of Christ to our selves: For if this be all, I may well say, in allusion to those words of our Saviour (*Mat. 5. 47.*) *What do you more than others?* more than those others, who said, *Lord, Lord.*

2. You must rightly understand, what are the commodities, that Jesus Christ doth offer or expose, and withal the true value and worth of them, they being the fruits of his Righteousness [Remission of sin, Reconciliation with God, Redemption, Justification unto life, Everlasting salvation.] It is the office of Gods Ministers, faithfully to acquaint sinners, that although Christ hath done his work, in bearing the burden of their iniquities, in the punishment thereof, nevertheless there is a certain burden or yoke of duty, to which every sinner is to submit his neck and shoulders, that would have the benefit of Christs sufferings actually conferred upon him; which yoke and burden (for

our

our comfort our Saviour assures us) *is easie and light.*

3. You must after a due deliberation, and count of the cost, come to a fixed resolution, to come up to the market-price, and to bid no less than Christ doth demand : For if we mean to *barter* with him, we must not think to bring him down to our terms (the wearing of his Livery, professing his name, doing some more cheap, easie, external duties--) but we must come up to his terms (*i. e.*) we must deny our selves, take up our cross and follow him, as he hath from the beginning told us, *Mat. 16. 24.* For though we may cozen or cheat our selves, yet Christ will neither cozen us, nor would he, that we should be cozened by our selves, or by any others.

4. Let no man deceive you with vain words, as if the doing according to the foresaid Resolution, were a bartering with your selves, and not with Christ, or a taking of the work out of Christs hand, and ascribing it to your own faithful performances : For this is but to do our own work under Christ, and by his helping grace ; this is to be workers together with God ; this is under Christ to do our own part, for the saving of our selves, which every sinner must do, who expects to be saved through Christ, *Acts 2. 40. 1 Tim. 4. 16.* 'Tis true, as the Doctor says, That the work, which Christ came to do in the world, was to bear our iniquities, and to lay down his life a ransom for our sins ; but withal it concerns us all to remember, that we have a work or works to do, that the benefit of that his ransom and sufferings may be ours, whereupon as to us they may not at last prove in vain, and we reproached, as those who have *rejected, or frustrated the counsel of God against*

against our selves, Luk. 7. 30. Our only work is not to give up our sins to Christ, to lay them upon his shoulders, or to believe, that he hath born them. We can never barter, or commute with Christ meerly upon such terms. Nor let us regard such vain words, as are here suggested by the Doctor, as if repenting for our sins, and doing our duty, that we may be saved by Christ, were in effect to say, Our repentance, our duties, shall bear our iniquities. The truth is, in these four things,

1. Whether we repent, or not repent, whether we do, or not do our duty, most undoubtedly Christ hath born our iniquities.

2. If Christ had not born our iniquities, although we had done our duty in repenting, our repentance would have been to no saving purpose; for we must still our selves have born our iniquities notwithstanding.

3. Though Christ hath born our iniquities, nevertheless repentance for sin, and converting therefrom to God in Christ, are our duties, and duties of such indispensable necessity, that unless we do repent and be converted, we our selves must bear our iniquities in the eternal punishment thereof.

4. To repent and to do our duty, that we may not our selves in this sort bear our iniquities, is not in any rational construction to say, as the Doctor, it seems, doth interpret it, That our repentance and duties shall bear our iniquities.

I have been the more copious in answer to the said passages of the Doctor, that I might preserve, or rescue the souls of men, from being ensnared thereby: And although I expect no thanks for my pains from many, but contempt and derision ra-

H

ther,

ther, nevertheless forasmuch as I look upon the said passages, as dangerous gins and snares, suited in their own nature to entangle sinners, instead of tending to their edification, in ought that is good, I shall not repent of this my work and labour of love.

I will now proceed to the proposal of such useful Questions, as in the beginning of this Chapter, I intimated should be the subject of several the Chapters following.

C H A P. X I X.

In what sence may it be truly said, That we are interested in Christs Merit or Satisfaction. In answer hercunto it is said, That three things may possibly be meant, by the Merit or Satisfaction of Christ, which being distinctly specified, the Question is accordingly determined.

FOrasmuch as such sayings as these, are ordinarily heard from the mouthes, and to be seen in the printed Sermons of many popular Preachers (*Believers are interested in the Merits of Christ, They may lay claim to his Merits, Christs Satisfaction is theirs, They may challenge it as their own--*) and forasmuch as such sayings, are by the common sort of Hearers and Readers (not to mention any the Authors accustomed to such words) either not at all understood, or misunderstood; and indeed forasmuch as such sayings do need

need a due explication ; as well therefore to promote the truth, as to prevent error, in the minds of people , by their mis-conceptions , I will propose , and answer the following Question.

Quest. In what sence may it be truly said, That we are interess'd in Christs merit and satisfaction, or, That we may challenge, and lay claim thereunto as Ours ?

Ans. Although there hath been enough said already, for a due resolution of this, in the determination of the third Question, nevertheless for the more abundant satisfaction of any, who perhaps may need it, I will answer thereunto, as followeth.

There be three things, which possibly may be meant by the Merit and Satisfaction of Christ.

1. Christs Righteousness it self, or his very doings and sufferings themselves, wherein his Righteousness did consist.

2. The valuableness, satisfactoriness, or meritoriousness of that his Righteousness and Obedience.

3. The thing or things, which by Christs meritorious obedience were merited. These three do differ in sence and signification, as Efficient, Efficiency, and Effect ; The first (Christs Righteousness or Obedience) hath the nature of an *Efficient* cause ; The second (the satisfactoriness of Christs Obedience) of *Causality* ; The third (the thing or things merited) of an *Effect* so caused. Now when we say, that we are interess'd in Christs merit and satisfaction, that they are Ours, that they are imputed to us, or bestowed upon us, the words (Merit or Satisfaction) are to be understood

derstood in the third sence of the words, and in neither of the two former sences. If the Question were thus formed or worded, What is the subject of Christs merit or satisfaction? It is truly to be answered,

1. As merit is taken in the second sence, the subject thereof (I mean, *Subiectum immediatum, seu inhesionis*) is Christs merit or satisfaction, as taken in the first sence of the words before specified: For the worthiness (the *Vu aptitudinalis*) or aptitude of Christs Righteousness to merit or satisfy, hath to that his Righteousness, the habitude of an Adjunct, even as the keenness of a Knife, or its aptitude to cut, hath to the Knife it self the same kind of respect.

2. As merit or satisfaction is taken in the first sence, yea also in the second sence of the words, as before specified, so Christ himself is the subject thereof, I mean, *Subiectum denominationis*: In these two sences, his Merit and Satisfaction is truly his own Merit and Satisfaction, and so to be denominated, but not Ours, they being in the said sences of the words Incommunicable to us.

3. As Christs Merit or Satisfaction are taken in the third sence of the words before-named, Believers are the subject thereof; for they are the persons, who have interest in, or do partake of the saving fruits, effects, or benefits thereof, or thereby purchased. Now in this only sence (in my apprehension) can Christs merit or satisfaction, be truly said to be Ours, To be imputed to us, or bestowed upon us, or we to have interest in it, or (as is the usual expression of some Preachers) to have it made over to us.

Briefly, In such a sence as Our Demerit may be said

said to be Christs, so his Merit may be said to be Ours. As the word [Merit] so the word Demerit may possibly mean three things ;

1. The evil act, or action of sinning.
2. The demeritoriouness, or deservingness of punishment, that doth necessarily adhere to that evil action.

3. The punishment it self thereby deserved.

Now in the two former senses of the word, a sinners Demerit is his own and not Christs ; nor did Christ ever assume to, or take upon himself our Demerit in any such sense, but only in the third sense of the word, as that word doth import the punishment it self, which we by our sins had merited or deserved.

C H A P. X X.

Q. To what profit would the Righteousness of Christ in it self, imputed to the justification of a sinner, be more than the Imputation of it in the benefit thereof? Answ. None at all, except that be a benefit, which the Familists do pretend unto, and which they call Our being Christed with Christ. The suffrage of the very learned Dr. Henry More. An Objection answered, taken from the pretence of several benefits, which being distinctly specified in the following Chapters, are there manifested to be null and void.

Quest. CUI bono, To what purpose or profit, would the Righteousness of Christ imputed, or the imputation thereof (in the sence here disowned) to the justification of a sinner, be more than the imputation of it, in the benefit thereof unto him, viz. the remission of his sin?

Answ. None at all, so far as I have been able, by all that I have heard or read hitherunto, to comprehend: For what more doth a sinner need, or can he in reason desire to receive from God, or is he capable of receiving from God through Christ, than a free and full pardon of all his sins, upon his faithful and penitential return to God in him? What more should God do for a penitent and believing soul, than to be merciful to his sins, or to him a sinner (these are Scriptural expressions of Gods pardoning mercy, Ps. 51. 1. Luk. 18. 13. Heb. 8. 12.) for the Righteousness sake of Christ,

Christ, or the meritoriousness thereof? Is there any thing beyond Heaven, that a believing sinner, a sanctified soul, can desire? And what is it, that can keep a sinner out of the Kingdom of Heaven, but sin unpardoned? Sin retained, doth indeed keep the gate of Heaven fast shut against us, by the arm of the Almighty; but sin remitted, or the remission of sin, makes those everlasting doors to fly open, even as that iron gate did to Peter of its own accord, *Act. 12. 10.* whereupon to every pardoned soul, there is an *entrance ministred abundantly, into the everlasting Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.* I know no benefit, that a sinner is capable of receiving, by any imputation of Christs Righteousness, beyond what hath been said, he doth, or shall enjoy, through the pardon of his sin, unless we shall account it a benefit to be Christed with Christ; a benefit, which as I do not understand, so neither do I think it to have any existence, otherwise than as of old, in the brains of *Jacob Behmen*, and *Henry Nicols*, so in those their followers, styled, *The Tribe or Family of Love*, who have inter'd Our being Christed with Christ, from such an Imputation of Christs Righteousness unto us, which being by many others unwarrantably asserted, is in this Treatise deservedly disclaimed and opposed. I do here call to mind the words of the very learned Doctor *Henry More*, very pertinent to the present purpose.

If you prescind it (says he) from remission of sin, through the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross, this phrase Imputative Righteousness, hath no signification at all, and that therefore there is no damage done to our Religion, if it be not accounted a distinct Article, from the Remission of sins in the blood of Christ: For

it cannot afford any true and useful sence distinct there-from, nay I may say, any that is not mischievous and dangerous, and such as tends to that loathsom and pestilential error of Antinomianism.

The premisses considered, there is just cause to conclude, that those Ministers, who without affectation of new phrases, and modes of speaking, do love still to utter *ἰσχυρον λεγον* (as is the Apostles expression, 1 Cor. 14. 9.) *intelligible speech*, or (as our Translation renders it) words easie to be understood, I mean, who do in plain down-right Scripture-language, preach remission of sin, through the blood, righteousness, or obedience of Christ, do preach all that is true, or truly comfortable in that doctrine, which in the Sermons and Writings of many, doth go under the name of Christs imputed Righteousness.

Object. But do not the contrary minded pretend, that Justification, by the Imputation of Christs Righteousness it self to a sinner, is a greater benefit, than remission of sin, and that also, which a sinner, over and above the pardon of his sin, bath absolute need of, in order to his admittance into the Kingdom of Heaven?

Answer. I am not altogether ignorant, of what is to that purpose pretended by too too many of my Brethren, whose pretences I shall faithfully relate, and because I do judg them to be weak and groundless, I will endeavour to manifest the same in the ensuing Chapters.

CHAP. XXI.

One benefit pretended by divers, That by Remission of sin, a sinner is freed from the punishment deserved by his fault, but by Christs Righteousness imputed, he is freed from the fault it self, the vanity of which pretence is discovered. Several Objections answered, wherein is shewen, That a sinner may be dis-oblinded from suffering, the punishment deserved for his fault, and yet remain faulty still; and that it is repugnant to the nature, as well as to the Law of God, for God to repute a sinner to be that, which he is not, or not to have committed those faults, which he hath committed. That it is one thing for God to repute a person to be innocent, and quite another to be dealt with respectively to impunity as innocent. In what sence a Thief having made satisfaction for his theft, is in the sence of the Law a Thief still. The main ground of mistake in this matter specified.

1. IT is pretended, that by remission of sin, the sinner is freed from the punishment deserved by his fault, but by his justification, through Christs Righteousness imputed to him, he is freed from faultiness, or the fault it self. To this purpose saith Mr. John Warner, in his Book styled, *Distributa Fidei justificantis qua justificantis*, printed in

in the year 1657, the Book it self being chiefly written, in opposition to Dr. Hammond, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Woodbridge, and my self, as to several passages in my Exercitation, concerning the nature of forgiveness of sin.

His words, p. 139. are these; *Whereas pardon of sin doth take away Reatum poenæ, justification doth constitute a man so righteous, as to take away Reatum culpæ.*

To the same purpose I have read in another Author, who says, *That whereas remission of sin takes away the punishment, justification takes away the fault, so that the Law hath no power to pronounce us faulty.* So Mr. Anth. Burges of Just. 2d. part, p. 268.

As for the vanity of this pretence, I have said enough already, partly in this Treatise, and partly in the 4th. Chapter of my Exercitation, concerning the Nature of forgiveness of sin, and if need be, am ready to say more, for the discovery thereof. And for the better understanding of the matter, let the difference betwixt Guilt of fault, and Guilt of punishment, be rightly understood, and still remembred, viz. That these two do differ *Sicut Meritum poenæ, and Obligatio ad luendum poenam*, in the former sence he is guilty, who hath committed a fault, and thereby hath deserved punishment, but in the latter sence he only is guilty, that remains actually obliged to suffer the punishment, which he by his fault had deserved. Now (as I have said before) as Christs Righteousness is no more, or otherwise imputed to a sinner, for his justification, than his pardon, so also his justification doth stand him in no more stead than doth his pardon; albeit Justification doth [even as Remission of sin] take away the guilt of punishment,
yet

yet it neither doth, nor can take away the guilt of fault, or faultiness it self, from the sinner; so that albeit the Law cannot pronounce a sinner, who is justified, to be guilty, as a person actually obliged to suffer for his fault, yet it may, and doth, and cannot otherwise choose but pronounce him faulty, or guilty of fault; yea the Law, in its expresse pronouncing a person to be pardoned, justified, or not guilty of punishment, doth implicitly pronounce him to be guilty of fault. So true are those sayings, *Quod factum est, fieri infectum non potest. Habere eripitur, habuisse nunquam, ita peccare cessat, peccavisse nunquam.* Hercupon it, was most truly said by the Poet,

— *Ne non peccârim, Mors quoq; non faciet.*

But because I am well assured, that Mr. *Warner* and Mr. *Burgeß* are not alone in that their mistake, as aforesaid, I will therefore relate certain passages, which I have somewhere read, objected against the truth here; and in the 4th. Chapter of my said Exercitation asserted, and return answer thereunto.

Object. *Either in forgiving sin, God must Peccantem non peccantem facere, or else he doth nothing?*

Ans. 1. If this be true, that God in forgiving sin, doth make a sinner to be no sinner, or ot faulty not faulty, then there is no difference at all as to this particular, betwixt forgiveness of sin and justification, seeing God in forgiving the sinner, as well as in justifying him, doth make him no sinner (*i. e.*) not faulty, or culpable.

Object. *Gods taking off the obligation to punishment, is in order to his making Peccantem non peccan-*

cantem (i. e.) a sinner to be no sinner ?

Ans. I deny, that Gods taking off a sinners obligation to punishment, is in order to any such matter, as is here pretended : For his taking off a sinners obligation to punishment, is in order to his non-inflicting, or his actual taking off the punishment it self, in his appointed time.

2. If it were truly said, that Gods taking off a sinners obligation to punishment, were in order to his making of a person faulty not faulty, then the difference betwixt remission of sin and justification, cannot be as is here pretended.

Object. *As long as a sinner is faulty, he is still obliged to punishment ?*

Ans. Woe be to us, if this be true. For if there be truth in that saying, we have all cause to say with the Disciples, *Who then can be saved ?*

2. Be it known to sinners, for their great Consolation in Christ, that what is here objected, is a notorious mistake ; the very truth being this, *viz.* That a sinner may be disobliged from suffering the punishment deserved by his fault, even when, and while he stands faulty, yea although to all eternity he doth stand faulty ; and in very deed, every pardoned or justified sinner shall so stand before God, it being a thing simply impossible, but that he, who is pardoned or justified by Gods free grace, through the Redemption which is in Christ Jesus, should remain faulty or culpable, as to his former sins, even unto all eternity.

Object. *It is not a contradiction to say, A sinner may become no sinner in Gods account, or by Imputation, that being done for him, and made over to him, which he should have done himself ?*

Ans. 1. Whereas the Scripture tells us, that
Christ

Christ is *our Mediator and Advocate with the Father*, this Objection supposeth him to have been our Mandatory, Proxie, or Delegate, and that Christs doings were so done for us, and in such a fence made over to us, as that God imputes the very things done, or the very doing of the things themselves unto us, the error of which imagination, I have already sufficiently (as I hope) demonstrated.

2. As a person having sin'd, or committed a fault, is thereupon to be denominated a sinner, even so doth God still from thence forward account of him, neither is it possible, that God should upon any account whatsoever, repute him otherwise than as a person faulty: For look upon what account any one shall affirm, that God doth repute any such person not faulty, he must upon the same account attribute to the All-seeing God a mistaken judgment (*i. e.*) to repute a person to be such a manner of person, as indeed he is not, or not to have committed the fault or faults, which indeed he hath.

3. As it is a contradiction for any one to say, That what is done, was never done, so it is a notorious untruth to say, That God reputes a man not to have done the faults, which he hath done, or not to have thereby deserved, what he hath deserved.

Object. What difference is there betwixt being imputed innocent, and dealt with as innocent? And if justified persons be accounted innocent, then their faultiness is done away by Imputation?

Ans. 1. There is a plain difference betwixt imputed (I think, the Objector would or should have said reputed) innocent, and dealt with respectively to impunity, as innocent: For the former

mer

mer doth imply, that the person is esteemed to have committed no fault, and thereupon that he is justified by works, the latter doth imply, that although a person be a sinner, yet his punishment is remitted, and that he is justified by free grace.

2. Persons that are justified by grace, or with a Gospel-kind of justification, are not accounted innocent (for upon the account of innocency, they must be justified by works and not by grace) and consequently their faultiness is not done away, by any imaginary imputation whatsoever.

3. It is one thing for God to repute a man Innocent, and quite another thing for God to repute him *As* Innocent : For, for God to repute a person Innocent, is to repute him to have committed no fault ; but for God to repute a person *As* Innocent, is for God to pardon him, or not punish him for his faults, but to deal with him as one, who never committed any.

4. Though I readily grant, that the faults of a person pardoned, or justified, are done away, as to the Non-imputation of guilt of punishment (in which respect, their pardon or justification is styled a Non-imputation of their faults to them, *Pf.* 32.2. 2 *Cor.* 5.18.) nevertheless I must still deny, that the faultiness of such a person is done away, and affirm the contrary, *viz.* That his faultiness, or his sin in the faultiness thereof, is still imputed to him (*i. e.*) that he is still reputed by God, to have done or committed a fault, and thereby to have deserved punishment.

Object. Though in justifying a sinner, God doth not Peccata non peccata facere, yet he may Peccantem non peccantem facere ?

Ans. Because God cannot do the former, there

therefore he cannot do the latter: For *Peccatum* and *Peccans* being *Conjugata*, it doth necessarily follow, that whosoever doth *Peccantem non Peccantem facere*, he must in order thereunto, *Peccatum non Peccatum facere*; for that cannot be done without this: A man cannot of *Peccans* be made *Non Peccans*, till that his *Peccatum* be made *Non Peccatum*. *Peccatum* must be undenominated *Peccatum*, or denominated *Non Peccatum*, before *Peccans* can possibly be undenominated *Peccans*, or denominated *Non Peccans*. I conclude therefore, that in his pardoning or justifying a sinner, God doth not, yea cannot, do either of the said things, I say, Cannot, because it implyes a contradiction, (*i. e.*) to make one, that hath sin'd, not to have sin'd, or that, which once was a sin, not to have been a sin.

Object. *A Thief having made satisfaction for his fault, is in the sence of the Law no longer a Thief, or faulty as to theft, and so it is in the case of a sinners justification?*

Ans^r. 1. I readily both give and grant, that look how it is with a Thief, who by himself hath made legal satisfaction for his fault, so it is with a justified sinner (I say not, who hath made satisfaction for himself in or by Christ, but) for whom Christ hath made satisfaction, and which satisfaction as so made by Christ, God hath accepted: And the case of both I judg to be this, *viz.* That although both of them do still remain faulty, or *Rei culpæ*, yet neither of them are *Obligati ad poenam* (*i. e.*) actually obliged to suffer the punishment deserved by, or for their faults.

2. Those words (A Thief, that hath satisfied for his fault, is in the sence of the Law no longer a Thief) are ambiguous: For as the word Thief
may

may signifie two things, *viz.* One that hath stolen, and one that is liable, or obliged to suffer for his theft, so the foresaid words may signifie, either that the Law cannot say, That such a one hath stolen, or, That such a one is liable, or obnoxious to be condemned. Now although the said Thief, who hath made legal satisfaction, be in the sence of the Law no longer a Thief, in the latter sence of the word [Thief] yet he still is a Thief in the former sence of the word, and shall be still so senced by the Law, even so long till theft be no theft, or the Law become never to have been a Law, or till that which is once done, shall become a thing that never was done.

Object. The faultiness of the sin, and of the person from that sin, are two things, the act of theft will be theft, but the person committing that, though once a Thief, yet having satisfied the Law, in the sence of that Law is become no Thief?

Ans. 1. This in part hath been already answered, in my reply to the Objection immediately foregoing, wherein hath been declared, in what sence of the word Thief, the said person is in the face of the Law looked upon as no Thief, and yet still as a Thief (*i. e.*) though not as one, who is obliged to suffer for his theft, yet as one, who hath stolen or committed theft.

2. I deny, that the faultiness of the sin, and of the person resulting from that sin, are two things, (*i. e.*) two separable things, as the Objector pretends: For there is not one faultiness of the sin, and another of the person, nor can the faultiness of theft, or of any other sin, be separated from the person of him, who hath committed such sins; the faultiness of such sins, will in the simple faultiness thereof, result upon the persons of such sinners,

so long as *Peccans* and *Peccatum*, *Furtum* and *Furans* are *Conjugata*.

3. One special reason, why some do not perceive their mistake in this pretended difference, betwixt remission of sin and justification (they asserting remission takes away the punishment, but justification the fault) seems to be this, *viz.* Because they do not discern, or mind the difference, betwixt that two-fold guilt of sin, which upon occasion hath oft-times before been mentioned, and once at least explicated [Guilt of fault, and of punishment] this being one main difference betwixt them, *viz.* That guilt of punishment is a thing separable from the sinner, but the guilt of fault not so: For although it be most true, that satisfaction being made for a fault (which was the case here suppos'd) the fault doth not *Redundare in personam* (*i. e.*) result upon the criminal, in the punishment thereof (this being the case of every pardoned, or justified sinner) nevertheless the *Reatus simplex*, faultiness it self (this being a thing inseparable from the sin and sinner) doth still result upon him, and shall abide upon him, till such time as the foresaid contradictions can be verified, which will be *Ad Græcæ Calendas*, neither in this world, nor in the world to come.

Thus have I answered to what I ever hitherto have read, touching the first grand benefit, which is pretended to be in a sinners justification, by the Imputation of Christs Righteousness unto him, over and above that, which doth consist in the Remission of his sin. — I proceed to the mention of another, which shall be the subject of the next Chapter.

C H A P. X X I I.

Another benefit pretended to be had by Justification, through Christs Righteousness imputed, over and above the pardon of our sins is, That remission of sin doth take off a sinners obligation to punishment, but justification by Christs Righteousness imputed, doth put him into a state of favour and acceptance with God, the vanity of which pretence is discovered. The definition of Justification, given by the late Assembly of Divines, in their lesser Catechism explicated, so as to reconcile it with the truth of Scripture, though not from tautology. Three main grounds of the mistake, in the difference here pretended, to be betwixt remission of sin, and justification by the Imputation of Christs Righteousness.

2. **A** Second benefit pretended to be had by justification, through Christs imputed Righteousness, over and above the pardon of our sins, is this, That remission of sin doth take off a sinners obligation to punishment, but justification puts him into a state of favour and acceptance with God.

To this pretence I reply,

1. Forasmuch as the punishment of sin is privative as well as positive, of loss as well as of sense, (as are the common expressions) and forasmuch as the loss, or privation of a sinners favour and ac-

ceptance with God, is one part of that punishment, which is threatned for sin, it cannot therefore be otherwise, but that if the punishment of our sins, through a pardon be remitted, but that our persons should be accepted, and restored into favour with God: To this purpose it is observable, that Reconciliation with God, and remission of sin, are used in Scripture as terms Synonymous, or of the same importance; reconciliation with God, being a part at least of remission of sin; for proof whereof, see 2 Cor. 5. 19. where *Gods reconciling the world to himself*, is said to be his not *imputing to them their trespasses*, which non-imputation is (as hath been before-said) all one with remission of sin. See also Heb. 2. 17. and 9. 12. where we find it to be all one, for Christ to make reconciliation for sinners, as to purchase remission, or redemption for them. See Act. 10. 43. with Rom. 5. 11. To receive remission of sin, and to receive atonement or reconciliation with God, are there mentioned as the same thing.

2. I desire the Reader to consider, whether, if a sinner through the remission of his sins, be not brought into an estate of favour and acceptation with God, the Psalmist had sufficient ground to pronounce a sinner blessed, upon the account of the forgiveness of his sins. Had not remission of sin, in its very nature, implied the acceptation of our persons with God, the Psalmist would doubtless not have said, as there he doth once and again, [*Blessed is the man, whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered, and Blessed is the man, to whom the Lord imputeth no iniquity.*] Psal. 32. 1.

Quest. Do not the late Assembly of Divines, make justification to be more than remission of sin, as seems by that description of justification, which in
their

their lesser Catechism, is by them described to be An all of Gods free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us —

Ans. 1. That God accepts us as righteous, for the righteousness sake of Christ, is the truth of Scripture, and a truth worthy of all acceptation; but that this is for the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us, no Scripture doth expressly affirm, and forasmuch as those Divines do not explain the meaning of that their saying, I am willing to construe it, in such a sense as agrees with the Scriptures, and as hath been opened in the third Chapter of this Treatise.

2. I am willing also to make such a construction of those additional words, in their description of justification (And accepteth us as righteous in the sight of God) as to reconcile them to the truth of Scripture; and the best construction, that possibly (to my understanding) can be made thereof, is this, *viz.* That those words are a meer tautology. Gods pardoning us, is all one with his cleansing us from all unrighteousness; whereupon be it seriously considered, How God can be said to cleanse us from all unrighteousness, and not *eo nomine*, accept us in his sight as righteous: For there being sins of omission, as well as commission, if God pardon the former, as well as the latter, he must of necessity accept of our persons as righteous; for as by pardoning a sinner his sins of commission, he accepts of him as a person, that hath done no evil, so by pardoning him his sins of omission, God accepts him as a person, that hath performed all good, and what is this, but to accept him as righteous, positively righteous? There needs no more therefore to righteousness, than pardon

don of sin: For that which puts an offender into such a state, as if he had broken the Law in nothing, and had performed it in every thing, that doth necessarily justify, or constitute him righteous.

The premisses considered, it doth evidently appear, That to say, By the remission of our sins, God dischargeth us from the punishment of them, and by justification he accepts us as Righteous, is all one as to say, That by remission of sin God pardoneth, or dischargeth us from our sins of Commission, and by Justification he pardoneth, or dischargeth us from our sins of Omission; and how unreasonable this assertion is, it's easie to determine.

The main grounds of the difference in this Chapter, pretended to be betwixt remission of sin and Justification, seem to be these:

1. Because such pretenders do not consider, that there are sins of Omission, as well as of Commission, and that whensoever, or to whomsoever God pardons the one, he pardons the other.

2. Because they fancy an Imputation of Christs Righteousness to a sinner, in or towards his justification, which is not towards, or in order to his pardon; whereas it is the undoubted truth of Scripture, that Christs Righteousness is no more, or otherwise imputed for, or in order to the one, than the other.

3. Because they fancy such a kind of Imputation of Christs Righteousness, or that it is in such a sense imputed to a sinner in his justification (they making it not the *Medium* unto a sinners righteousness, but the very thing it self) as is repugnant both to reason, and Scripture.

CHAP. XXII.

A third benefit pretended by a sinners justification, through Christs imputed Righteousness, over and above remission of sin is, That this latter doth only free the sinner from eternal death, but justification doth moreover entitle him to eternal life, the vanity of which pretence is discovered; with an answer to what is objected to the contrary by Mr. Anth. Burges. An Answer also to the Question, Whether believing sinners are not restored by Christ, unto a greater degree of felicity, by their justification through Christs Righteousness (supposing the Imputation of it) than upon the bare score of the forgiveness of their sins? The Contradictions of Mr. Anth. Burges, in certain particulars instanc'd in.

A Third benefit (much-what of affinity with that in the foregoing Chapter) pretended by a sinners justification, through Christs imputed Righteousness, over and above the Remission of his sins, is, That remission of sin doth only free a sinner from eternal death, but justification doth more (*i. e.*) it entitles him to eternal life.

To this I reply, That the thing here pretended, hath been indeed asserted by several Writers and Preachers; but for the discovery of their mistake therein, I need not say much more, than to desire the Reader to reflect upon what hath been already

already said, specially in the foregoing Chapter, and withal to consider, That forasmuch as the loss, or forfeiture of our title to life, is one part of the deserved punishment of sin, it must needs follow, that a sinners deserved punishment being remitted through a pardon, he is *Ipso facto* and *eo nomine*, restored unto that title to life eternal, which by his sin he had lost or forfeited. If a sinner being obliged to lose heaven, and to be cast into hell for his sin, shall be once pardoned, through the dissolution of that his obligation, by a pardon he becomes *In statu quo prius*, he hath right to impunity of both kinds, I mean, to freedom from hell, and to the enjoyment of heaven. If the loss of the enjoyment of God be punishment of its kind (called therefore *Pœna damni*) then doth pardon of sin restore right to that enjoyment of God, else the sinner is not fully pardoned, no more than justified, as if a Traytor or Murderer be pardoned, yet must lose his goods, he is then pardoned as to his life and lands, but not as to his goods. So that a sinner so far forth as he is pardoned, he is justified, there being no more in the justification of an offender, than pardon of sin, as to the form, or formal nature of the thing.

I will spend this Chapter in answering such Arguments, as I have seen alledged, for the strengthening of the said vain pretence, and shall begin with Mr. *Anthony Burges*. He saith in his Book of Justification, the second part :

Object. It follows not, where all evil is removed in a subject capable, all good is introduced (if a man shall not be damned, he must be saved) for though these are inseparable, yet this doth not follow *Ex naturâ rei*, but extrinsically by the order and appointment of God, because God might have delivered a sin-

ner from hell, and yet have annihilated him, as a King may forgive a Malefactor by sparing his life, and yet not admit him for a Courtier, and make him a Favourite.

Is not Annihilation an eternal evil? Why then doth this Author, or how can he in reason suppose a person pardoned to be annihilated, he acknowledging withal, that pardon of sin doth remove the eternal evil, that was deserved?

Ans. 1. Although I grant, That hell-torments are one thing, and the annihilating of a sinner is another, yet I must needs say, That this learned Author, with certain others, do speak after a strange rate, or notion of pardon, who do speak of a person pardoned, or disoblighd from punishment, and yet will suppose him to be annihilated: For to suppose him to be annihilated, is to suppose him not to be pardoned, but punished, and that severely too.

2. They, who say, That God might have freed a sinner from eternal death, and then by annihilation have rendred him incapable of eternal life, do in plain consequence say, That God might have pardoned a sinner, and then have punished him.

3. Though I yield these three things;

1. That Annihilation is rather to be chosen, than hell, That *Præstat non esse, quam semper miserum esse.*

2. That upon that account, a sinner set free from hell, and yet annihilated, may be said to be pardoned in a diminutive sence, that is, to halves, or comparatively with himself, if he had been cast into that lake, which burneth with fire and brimstone for ever.

3. That God in his sovereignty, or by vertue of his absolute dominion, or *à priori*, might, if he had so pleased, have in such sort pardoned a sinner to halves by annihilation. This I yield: For as it is in Gods power to pardon a sinner upon what terms, in what way, and at what time, so also how

how far forth, or in what degrees it seemeth good to his divine wisdom and pleasure.

But these Concessions notwithstanding, be it considered, That God hath in his Word revealed his divine will and pleasure in this point, *viz.* That he is so well pleased with the satisfaction of his only begotten Son (Jesus Christ our Lord) as to promise unto, and in due time to bestow upon believing sinners, not a partial pardon, but a full and plenary pardon of sin; and from this plenary pardon so promised, according to Gods good pleasure, it doth, I say, necessarily follow, That if a sinner be pardoned with that pardon, which the Gospel promiseth, and which alone is here in question, he is *Ipsò facto*, restored into Gods favour and fatherly acceptation, and entitled to life eternal.

The premisses considered, I infer these three or four Conclusions:

1. That upon the removal of eternal evil from a person, who is pardoned, eternal good is immediately introduced, by Gods order and appointment.

2. That to grant (as the Objector here doth) that forgiveness of sin doth remove the eternal evil, is to yield the cause, and to acknowledg, that by Gods order and appointment, forgiveness of sin doth introduce eternal good, or a title to eternal life.

3. That if we do suppose a sinner pardoned, to be only freed from hell, and then annihilated, we do even then, therein, and thereby, suppose him not pardoned according to the tenor of the Gospel, or with such a plenary pardon as the Gospel promiseth; and consequently, that to argue after such a rate, as is here argued, is to forsake,
or

or to depart from the subject of the Question, a thing much unbeseeming a close Disputant, such as this Author was by many accounted.

4. That it is a groundless imagination to think, as too too many do, who having first unnecessarily distinguished of Christs obedience, into active and passive, do sort them to several distinct purposes, dogmatizing thereupon, That Christ by his passive obedience, hath freed us from the guilt of eternal death, and by his active obedience, hath procured us a title to eternal life, and That by forgiveness of sin we have freedom from the one, and by Justification by Christs Righteousness, we have title to the other. As particularly Dr. Owen speaks, in his Book of *Communion with God*. And because it is much to be desired, that Christians would *ἀναζητοῦν τὴν διακρίσιν* (as is the Apostles prayer for the *Philippians*, *Ch. 1. 10.*) first try, and then approve or disapprove, according to the different nature of things, my purpose is in certain Chapters of this Treatise, to expose to an impartial examination, what that Author hath dictated concerning this matter.

In the mean while, I shall offer two things to consideration :

1. Mr. Baxter says in those sheets, which he wrote in reference to Mr. Edw. Fowler's Book styled (*The design of Christianity.*)

We believe, says he, p. 17. That Christs habitual perfection, with his Active Righteousness, and his sacrifice, or sufferings, all set together and advanced in value, by their conjunction with his Divine Righteousness, were the true meritorious procuring cause of our pardon, justification, sanctification and salvation. Not one part imputed to this effect, and another to that, but all thus making up one meritorious cause of
all

all these effects, even of the Covenant, and all its benefits.

He adds, saying (and which is the main truth, which I do by this whole Treatise contend for)

And thus Christs Righteousness is imputed and given to us, not immediately in it self, but in the effects and fruits: As a ransom is said to be given to a Captive, because it is given For him, though strictly the ransom is given to another, and only the fruits of it to him.

This I take to be the Catholick Faith, in the Article before us.

2. Be it considered, That there is no *Medium* betwixt Life and Death, no middle condition rationally imaginable betwixt these two. Hereupon we may certainly conclude, That he who by the forgiveness of his sins, is freed from eternal death, cannot otherwise but be conceived to have a right to life eternal.

I proceed to answer certain other Arguments, objected from the Scriptures.

Object. The Apostle having said, that through Acts 13. Christ was preached to them the forgiveness of sins, he adds, as a further priviledg or benefit, saying, And by him all that believe, are justified. This is objected (if I do not mis-remember) in the said Book styled Communion with God.

Ans. 1. The words being translated out of the original, run thus, Be it known unto you therefore Men and Brethren, that by this man forgiveness of sins is preached unto you, and from all things, from which you could not be justified by the Law of Moses, this is the entire v. 38. in the Greck, and then it follows v. 39. By him every believing man is justified. The words being thus rendred, and an Emphasis

phasis laid upon καὶ (which is oft-times in Scripture as much as even) do clearly make the same thing to be meant by δικαιωθῆναι, that is meant by ἀποσις ἀμαρτιῶν, do clearly, I say, make justification and remission of sin to be the same thing, or of the self same adequate importance, that implying no more priviledg or benefit than this.

2. Read the words as we find them translated, and it is sufficiently clear, that the words (justification and remission) are but varied phrases of one and the same thing, it being the manner of Scripture, frequently to express the self same thing, by varied words and phrases.

3. The said Scripture, being alledged usually for the proving, that justification doth denote a further priviledg than forgiveness of sin, especially the Imputation of Christs active obedience, must for that purpose thus be paraphrased, *Through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins, and by him all that believe, have Christs active obedience imputed to them from all things, from which you could not have Christs active obedience imputed to you by the Law of Moses.* Hereupon let any Reader judge, whether this Scripture makes for the purpose, for which it is alledged, whether by Dr. Owen, or any other of the adverse Brethren in this controversy.

Some other Objections there are, but they are so weak, that no impartial or unprejudicate person will (I am most assured) be swayed by them; and therefore having answered the most considerable, I shall let pass the rest.

I shall now propound another Question.

Quest. *Are not believing sinners restored by Christ unto a greater degree of felicity, than Adam did lose, or forfeit by his sin, and are not Believers entitled*

entitled to this greater degree of glory by their justification, through the Imputation of Christs Righteousness to them, and not upon the meer score of the forgiveness of their sins?

Ans. In answer hereunto, I will set down in the first place, what the opinion of others is in this matter, and then speak my own sence.

1. There be many, who as they judg, that Believers are restored to a greater degree of felicity in this life, than *Adam* did enjoy in Paradise, so also that they shall enjoy through the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, a greater degree of heavenly glory, than *Adam* should have enjoyed upon his continuance in a state of innocency. But there are others who think, that both of them are justly questionable, and scarce proveable by the Scriptures, especially the latter.

2. There be others, asserting, That there is in the merits of Christ, not only *Plenitudo sufficientie*, but also *redundantie*, or that his satisfaction was super-satisfactory (not only *Legalis justitie*, but also *Super-legalis meriti* (as are the expressions of the very learned Dr. Reynolds, Bishop of Norwich, in some of his Sermons, if I do not mis-remember) they, I say, thus asserting, do yield, that Believers shall enjoy through Christ, a greater degree of glory in heaven, than they lost by the fall of *Adam*, or in him: But they say, That they are entitled unto this overplus of glory, not simply by vertue of the remission of their sins, or justification (for this, say they, doth only restore them *Ad statum quæ prius*, to such a degree of happiness as they lost in *Adam*.) but by vertue of the super-added grace of adoption; and of this opinion are those two learned Authors, Mr. Will. Bradshaw, and Mr. John Goodwin; and how far forth Mr.

Exiter

Baxter is inclinable thereunto, and what his opinion more fully is, himself hath declared in a peculiar Section thereof, in his Book against *Cosmopolitans*, if my memory do not fail me.

2. As for my own sense, I conceive;

1. That as the loss of Gods fatherly love and favour, and our becoming children of the devil, was one part of the punishment of mans sin.

2. As thereupon it follows, That our adoption, or being restored into Gods fatherly love and favour, is one prime branch at least of forgiveness of sin: So consequently,

3. That Believers are no otherwise entitled to that farther degree of glory, by vertue of their Adoption, than by vertue of the remission of their sins; and I do the rather conceive this to be the truth, because whatever that higher degree of glory here supposed is, I doubt not, but the loss or miss thereof is threatned, for sins committed against the Covenant of grace, together with a greater degree of positive punishment, than was threatned to *Adam*, for breach of the Covenant of works. Now forasmuch as Jesus Christ hath by his satisfaction, procured pardon for sins committed explicitly against the New, as well as the Old Covenant (always excepted to final non-performance of the conditions of that New Covenant, which are summarily comprehended in Repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ) and forasmuch as this pardon is promised, and vouchsafed to sinners, upon their repentance and faith in Christ, it doth, as I think, necessarily follow, That what sinner soever hath his sins (all his sins against both Covenants) pardoned, that person is immediately discharged, or freed not only

only from that punishment, and loss of favour, which he did incur, and forfeit in *Adam*, but he is moreover set free from that greater degree of punishment, which is threatned for sins committed against the Covenant of grace, and is also by his pardon, entitled to that higher degree of glory and happiness, which is supposed to be promised in the same. But that he is entitled thereunto by his justification, with such an Imputation of Christs Righteousness, as is here pretended, I see no reason at all to acknowledg, and therefore I must still deny it, till I see it proved, adding withal, that as for the said higher degree of heavenly glory, supposed to be enjoyed by Believers for Christs sake, I think it to be a matter rather of curious, than necessary enquiry, wherein we are not to be solicitous of being wise above what is written.

I shall close this Chapter with the words of Mr. *Anth. Burges*, the said Author of the Tract concerning Justification (*first part, p. 143, 144.*)

Remission of sin (says he) is not only Ablativa mali, but also Collativa boni, it is not a meer negation of punishment due to us, but also a plentiful vouchsafing of many gracious favours to us, such as a Son-ship, and right to eternal life.

These words in his first Book concerning Justification, when I compare with what he says directly and professedly contrary thereunto, in his second Book, which came forth some years after, which are these, p. 269.

(*Remission of sin and justification differ in this consideration, In forgiveness of sin there is Ablatio mali, in justification there is Collatio boni; when sin is forgiven, the eternal evil deserved is removed, but when we are justified, eternal good is promised.*)

When

When, I say, I compare those contradictory sayings of the same Author together, I call to mind, what is said to have been facetiously replied in Parliament, to one Mr. *Jordan*, a Member thereof, upon his declared change of mind [*What ailest thou, thou Jordan, that thou wast driven back?*] What ail'd this Author, so plainly and palpably to contradict both the truth and himself? It seems, that that Greek Proverb (*Δυσίως σπονδίζε--Second thoughts are best*) is not always true.

There are certain other contradictory passages in this Author, concerning the subject, which I am now treating upon.

He says, p. 268. *Whereas remission of sin doth only take away the guilt of sin, justification doth remove the sin it self.*

But he saith, p. 432. *Notwithstanding the Imputation of Christs active obedience, God doth see the imperfect graces and sins of his people.*

Again, Although it be this Author's professed design in his Book (second part) to maintain the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, in the sense impugned in this Treatise (he making Justification to consist of two integral parts, viz. Remission of sin, and Imputation of righteousness) nevertheless he seems plainly to contradict himself, and to yield the cause by me contended for in this Treatise, touching the manner of the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, my assertion, as aforesaid, being this, viz. That it is not in it self immediately, or in its essential nature imputed to us, but in the blessed effects, or benefits thereby purchased for us, and by God according to promise, confer'd on us.

And

And he saith the same, pag. 135, 136.

None say, Christs obedience is imputed unto us in such a sence, as that we should be said to be the efficient of that righteousness, but that we should be the passive subjects, receiving the benefit of it.

CHAP. XXIV.

Q. What are the evil Consequents, which do naturally flow from the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, in the sence here impugned? In answer hereunto, one mischievous consequence is specified, viz. That Christ is a sinner, and the greatest of sinners.

Quest. WHAT are the evil Consequents, which do seem necessarily to follow from that doctrine, touching the Imputation of Christs Righteousness unto us, in the sence which in this Treatise is disowned?

Ans. Having in the foregoing Chapters manifested, that no good at all, over and above Remission of sin, doth, or can come of it, this Question comes in very fitly to be demanded, What are the evil consequents to it? And if besides the No good, or profit, I shall be able to prove, that there are many mischievous consequences thereof, I hope, that those who have espoused it, will no longer be enamour'd with it, but will be contented rather to give it a Bill of divorce, and fairly to dismiss it.

Mr. Baxter saith, *It is the heart and root of so many errors, yea of the whole body of Antinomianism, that he would rather write a great volume against it, than leave it with a brief touch.*

(Mr. Baxter's Confession, p. 229. and p. 266.)
That it is the root of many dangerous errors, very plainly subverting the Christian Religion.

And in those few sheets, which he wrote in reference to Mr. Edw. Fowler's Book, styled, *The Design of Christianity*, his words are, p. 12.

It is not to be denied, or hid, that more than down-right Antinomians, have so ill expounded the points of Christs suretyship, and of the Imputation of our sin to him, and of the Imputation of his Righteousness to us, as hath proved the great occasion of some mens running into the contrary error, yea and as would exclude all pardon of sin, and all true Religion, had their notions been practically and prevalently held.

He names also several Authors, both of our own and forreign Churches (*Olevian, Ursin, Piscator, Parau, Windeline, Camero, Wetton, Gataker, Bradshaw, Le Blank*—) by whom their opinions have been confuted.

Mr. Joseph Truman, in his Book styled, *The great Propitiation*, p. 92. 93. saith thus ;

You may see, how contrary to reason (as well as Scripture) that way of theirs is, who hold, that Christs fulfilling of, and Christs obedience to the Law is accounted, imputed, as if Believers had fulfilled and obeyed the Law in his so doing : You may hold the active and passive Righteousness of Christ, a satisfaction to justice, for our breach of the Law, both of them a valuable consideration, on which God will acquit the Offenders, so they do but perform the Gospel-conditions ; and I can easily (says he) answer
all

all the Arguments I have read, to exclude his active obedience, from being part of the satisfaction to justice, for the breach of the Law: But to hold over and beside such a satisfaction for our disobedience, that there is made over to us a right to his obedience, so as God to account us, as if we had obeyed the Law in him, beside the danger of making God account men as perfect as Christ, and accounting, that which is not true, it is

1. *Altogether needless.*—
2. *It makes the death and sufferings of Christ needless.*—
3. *It dissolves the Law, its obliging us to obedience.*—

I will instance in some of the prime mischievous consequences, of the doctrine here opposed, which being cryed up by some Authors, as a Gospel-mystery (a Mystery of piety) will manifest it to be indeed A *mystery of iniquity*.

1. It follows from thence, That Christ was made a sinner, or That by Gods Imputation, and mans Reputation, Jesus Christ was the greatest sinner in the world.

Mr. *Eyre* affirms the former, as hath been said, the latter is asserted by Dr. *Grew*, in his late printed Sermons upon *Jer. 23. 6.* (he quoting the Authority of *Luther*, for one branch of the assertion, touching Gods Imputation, and that Scripture in *Mar. 15. 28.* touching mans Reputation) as if, because he was reputed a transgressor by the unbelieving Jews, therefore it's to be concluded, that he was, or was to be so reputed by all others. What Christian ears can bear with the sound of such a saying as this, That by Imputation of God, Jesus Christ was the greatest sinner in the world? And how false is it to say, That God did repute Jesus

Christ to be otherwise, whether in life or death, than indeed he was (*i.e.*) *A Lamb without spot and blemish, holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners*, as the Scriptures speak of him? 1 Pet. 1. 19. Heb. 7. 26.

The truth is, if any such saying hath dropt from the pen of *Luther*, it is not to be justified, but to be abhorr'd: For Christ by Imputation was no sinner at all, nor so reputed, either by God or man, except such as did not know him, and who therefore hang'd him on the tree.

As for the said Dr. *Grew*, he says indeed (p. 23, 24.) That in this sense only Christ was made sin for us, in that he took on him the obligation to punishment: Where let two things be observed;

1. That the Doctor doth mistake and mis-report the true sense of that Scripture, wherein Christ is said to have been made sin for us, the true sense whereof is (as hath been already said) not that he was made sin it self, or sin at all for us, but a sin-offering, or a sacrifice for sin.

2. Be it observed, That the Doctor doth not say, that Christ took on him An obligation, but The obligation to punishment; by which saying, he must rationally be understood to mean || Our obligation to punishment, or the same obligation, wherein, or whereby we sinners were bound to punishment. And if he had meant otherwise, his own reason and understanding would no more have suffered him, to approve that saying fathered upon *Luther*, of Christ his being the greatest sinner in the world by Imputation, than his stomach would have served him to have eaten his excrements,

|| The error whereof I have manifested in another Chapter against Mr. *Ferguson*.

C H A P. X X V.

Another evil Consequence of the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, in the sense disowned, viz. That Believers are as perfectly Righteous, as is Christ The Righteous, yea, that they are more Righteous, than if they had in their own persons perfectly kept the whole Law, and that they are as acceptable to God the Father, as is Christ himself. The falshood and impiety of which sayings at large manifested, and some Scriptures which are suborned to speak against the truth, vindicated. That man may be said to be justified by the Righteousness of another, and not by his own, three wayes, in the Application of which distinction it is plainly declared, in what sense we are, and in what sense we are not justified by the Righteousness of another, and not by our own. Several unjustifiable and intolerable sayings of Dr. Owen, in his Book styled, Communion with God, related, with brotherly and necessary animadversions thereupon.

2. **A** Nother evil Consequence of this doctrine, is, That Believers are as perfectly Righteous, as is Jesus Christ the Righteous.

This Consequence is owned by divers, among whom I shall instance only in two or three Authors ;

The first shall be Mr. *Will. Eyre*, who in his fore-cited Assize-Sermon, says, p.10.

That upon Christ his becoming our Surety, and taking our sins upon himself, sinners are thereby made as perfectly Righteous, as Christ the Righteous.

Nor doth he content himself only to say it, but he doth also wrest that Scripture in 1 *Job.3.7.* to prove it; I say, wrest that Scripture to prove it; for that Text proves no such thing, but only this, viz. That he who doth righteousness, is born of him (as is the expression, 1 *Job.2.29.*) that is, doth resemble him, or is like him, as a child resembles the father who begat him. Yea, he doth bless that his false doctrine with his subsequent prayer, therein taking Gods holy Name in vain, by saying, *Now the good Lord open all our eyes, to see the real and glorious excellency of this Priviledg.* But while he doth thus proclaim the Priviledg of the Saints, have we not cause to say, That he hath forgotten that Prerogative of our Saviour, mentioned by the Apostle, *Col.1.18.* it being his right to have the Preheminence in all things? Certainly *St. Peter's* eyes were not opened to see this as his priviledg, when he said to our Saviour, *Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord;* for had he owned any such glorious priviledg, or been sensible of the excellency thereof, he would in all reason have mated his Lord and Master (as I may so say) or have set himself cheek by chole with him, and have said, *Abide by me, keep not at distance from me;* for I am as perfectly Righteous, as thou art. The same Author doth further amplify and illustrate the said priviledg of the Saints, saying, p.12.

This Priviledg is not only negative, but positive,

as they are unclothed and stript of their own filthy garments (Zech.3.4.) so they are clothed upon with the immaculate robe of Christs Righteousness, adequate and commensurate to the Law of God ; by the obedience of one (says the Apostle, Rom.5.19.) many are made righteous (i. e.) perfectly and compleatly righteous, more than if they had kept the Law in their own persons ; hereby we come to have boldness and confidence in the sight of God, his infinite purity and holiness doth not daunt, or discourage us from going to him ; for as Christ is before him, so are all they that do believe in him, through that Righteousness of his, that is put upon them, see Eph. 3.12. Rom.5.2.

But the meaning of those words (By the obedience of one many are made Righteous) is not as this Author expounds it (perfectly and compleatly Righteous, more than if they had kept the Law in their own persons) but the meaning is, They are, for the meritoriousness sake of Christs obedience, made Righteous, with another kind of Righteousness, than is that, which doth consist in their personal, perfect and compleat performance of the Law of God, yea, with such a kind of Righteousness, as is not competible with it, viz. with the pardon of their sins, or that kind of evangelical justification, which is styled, The gift of grace, v.15. and the free gift of many offences to justification, v.16. and the gift of Righteousness, v.17. For sinners to be made, or constituted Righteous, is in the sense of the Apostle (as appears by the context) to be justified, out of the abundance of Gods grace in Christ, or to be freely pardoned ; which no persons can be, or be said to be, who are as perfectly and compleatly Righteous, as if they had kept the Law in their own

persons: For those who are as perfectly and completely righteous, and more righteous, than if they had kept the Law in their own persons, are not justified of grace at all, or are they capable of a gracious pardon.

And as for the boldness and confidence, which the Apostle speaks of in *Eph. 3. 12.* and *Rom. 5. 2.* it is an holy boldness and confidence, grounded upon their pardon of sin and justification, through Gods grace in Christ (mentioned in the foregoing Paragraph) and not upon any such mis-construction, of the sacred Scriptures, as this Author was so extremely over-bold and confident to suggest.

As for that in *Zech. 3. 4.* the true fence whereof is here perverted by Mr. *Will. Eyre*, I shall vindicate it from his abuse in *Ch. 34.* in answer to Dr. *Owen*, by whom it is in like sort perverted also.

And whether Believers may be truly, or fitly said to be cloathed with the Righteousness of Christ, or to have Christs Righteousness put upon them, I shall speak my thoughts more at large in a peculiar Chapter, and in answer to that Question purposely put. In the mean while I shall presume to say, That it is not only false, but (as I am perswaded) blasphemous to say, as doth this Author, That as Christ is before God, so are all they that do believe in him, through his Righteousness: For Jesus Christ is before God a Saviour of sinners, and whereas Believers in Christ are before God sinners still (*i. e.*) *Rei culpæ*, guilty persons, and as such (however pardoned) they do still stand before God, and shall so stand to all eternity. Christ is before God the Son of God by nature, and Righteous without a pardon, whereas Believers in Christ, are before God his sons by the adoption of grace, and Righteous by, or with a gracious pardon, in the blood of Christ.

The next to Mr. *Eyre* I will quote, is the Author of the Book styled, *The Marrow of Modera Divinity*, who says, *p. 127.* That

That God the Father, in that voice from heaven, Mat. 3. 17. and Joh. 12. 30. doth cheare the hearts of poor sinners, and greatly delight them with singular comfort, and heavenly sweetness, assuring them, that whosoever is married unto Christ, and so in him by faith, he is as acceptable to God the Father, as Christ himself, according to that of the Apostle (He hath made us acceptable in his beloved, Eph. 1. 6.) Wherefore if you would be acceptable to God, and be made his dear child, then by faith cleave unto his beloved Son Christ, and hang about his neck, yea, and creep into his bosom, and so shall the love and favour of God be as deeply insinuated into you, as it is into Christ himself, and so shall God the Father, together with his beloved Son, wholly possess you, and be possessed of you, and so God and Christ and you, shall become One entire thing, according to Christs prayer, That they may be One in us, as thou and I are One. —

I need say little more to the words of this Author, than was said to those of Mr. Will. Eyre, it being enough for me to say to every Reader of these lines, as the High-Priest said to the by-standers at Christs arraignment (he indeed causlessly, but I justly) *Ye have heard their blasphemy*: Only I desire the Reader to observe further ;

1. How he doth wrong the Apostle, by bringing him in to abett him in his said blasphemy, I mean, by alledging that in Eph. 1. 6. as if the Apostle in saying, That God hath made the believing *Ephesians* accepted in the Beloved, had said, That they were as acceptable to God, as Christ himself ; whereas it will appear, That the Apostle did intend by that very expression, to insinuate a peculiarity of the Fathers Love, to that his only begotten Son, who lay in his bosom from all eternity.

2. Ob-

2. Observe, how like a canting *Familiarist* he speaks, in saying, That upon our hanging about Christs neck, and creeping into his bosom (*i.e.*) upon our believing in Christ, God the Father, together with his beloved Son, will wholly possess us, and be possessed of us, and so God and Christ and we, shall become One Entire Thing.

3. Observe, how notoriously he doth abuse the words of our Saviours Prayer, and our Saviour Christ himself in them, as if in praying, That Believers might be one, as the Father and he were one, he had requested, That they all may become One entire thing. To pray, That Believers may keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, that they may accord and continue uniformly in one faith and doctrine, that this agreement of all, (God the Father, Son and Believers) may be a powerful means of convincing the world, that Jesus was the Christ, sent by God--To pray, I say, to this, or the like purpose, is this to pray, That God and Christ and Believers, may become One entire thing?

Thus have I cited a second Author, or Authors should I say? forasmuch as there are so many, who by their several Epistles do applaud the Divinity of his Book, no less than five names.

The third Author is brought to my hand by Mr. *Samuel Rolz* (a zealous Asserter of the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, in the sence here challenged) in his late Book styled *Prodromus*, who informs me, that the words following, are the words of the most excellent Mr. *Richard Hooker*, in his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, or in some of his Writings annexed thereunto, p.4. *alias* 38.

But the Righteousness, wherein we must be found, if we will be justified, is not our own, therefore we

can-

cannot be justified by any inherent quality. Yet even the man, that is in himself full of sin, being found in Christ by faith, and having his sin remitted through repentance, him God beboldeth with a gracious eye, putteth away his sin, by not imputing it, and accepteth him in Jesus Christ as perfectly righteous, as if he had fulfilled all that was commanded him in the Law. Shall I say, more perfectly righteous, than if himself had fulfilled the whole Law? I must take heed what I say, but the Apostle saith, 2 Cor. 5.21. That we might be made the Righteousness of God in him. Such we are in the sight of God the Father, as is the very Son of God himself.

To this my reply is ;

1. That Judaism, or a Judaical Righteousness, is that Righteousness, which St. Paul doth call his own, and this in opposition to Christianity, or the practical knowledg of Christ, wherein alone he did desire to be found ; and therefore it doth not follow from thence, that a sinner cannot be justified, or freed from condemnation , upon the account of any inherent Christian grace , or graces.

He calls it his own righteousness, not because it was his at what time he spake those words, but because it was his at what time he was a Jew, and before a Convert to the faith of Christ.

2. A man may be said to be justified by the Righteousness of another, and not by his own, in a three-fold sence :

1. By way of merit.
2. By way of form.
3. By way of a condition.

In the first sence it's most true, that the Righteousness, by which we must be justified, is the Righteousness of another (even of Jesus Christ the Righteous) and not our own.

2. But in both the other senses, it is altogether untrue : For

1. That

1. That Righteousness, by, or (to speak more accurately) with which a sinner is formally justified, or made righteous, is alwayes a mans own, viz. his pardon, or the remission of his sins.

2. That Righteousness, by which as a condition of his discharge, a sinner is justified, is always his own, and not anothers, viz. His own faith.

It's true indeed, that in respect of procurement, both these Righteousnesses (with and by which a sinner is justified) are Christs, and in respect of collation, they are Gods, but in respect of possession, or performance, they may be well said to be our own Righteousness, they being freely given us of God, for the sake of Christ, *Act. 13. 31*.

And that sinners are in this last sence of the phrase, justified by some inherent quality, or grace of their own, certainly Mr. Hooker would not deny, for he in that Citation saith, That it is through repentance, that our sins are remitted; which is as much as to say, That by, or through repentance a sinner is pardoned, justified, or not condemned by God.

3. The Apostle in saying (We are made the Righteousness of God in Christ) doth not say either expressly or constructively, That we are made more perfectly righteous, than if our selves had fulfilled the whole Law; no more than he says the same thing in *Rom. 5. 19*. which was for that purpose alledged by Mr. W. Eyre, but to no purpose, as I have manifested.

4. As for the closing words (*Such we are in the sight of God the Father, as is the very Son of God himself*) I have said enough already, declaring, how such sayings are not to be justified, but to be abominated, as most false, if not blasphemous, there being nothing to be alledged for the excuse thereof,

thereof, save the innocent intention of the Authors.

I will close this Chapter with a request, That the foresaid distinction [touching the several sentences, wherein a man may be said to be justified by the Righteousness of another, and not by his own] may the rather be observed, because it may serve for a two-fold purpose ;

1. It may be subservient to us, how to give a ready and satisfactory answer to that passage of Dr. *Owen* [with certain others] in his often cited Book, wherein he says, p.167.

Christ is made of God to the Saints Righteousness, and they will own nothing else to that purpose.

To this I answer :

1. For Christ to be made of God Righteousness to the Saints, is not for God to impute Christs Righteousness immediately in it self to them (as the Doctor would have it, he saying to that purpose as in other places, so p.110. That that perfection of obedience, which we have in Christ, is imputed to us) but in the saving effects of it, according to that of the Apostle, 1 Cor.1.30. *He is of God made unto us Wisdom and Righteousness, and Sanctification and Redemption (i. e.)* he is causally, efficiently, or effectually made all these unto us : And one would think, that this Doctor should content himself with that sense of the phrase [Christ his being made of God Righteousness unto us] for he says, p.104. *That in the Covenant God becomes our God, and we his people, and thereby all his Attributes are ours (i. e.) as to the benefit of them,* as else-where he interprets it.

The Doctor doth not say, That upon our being in Covenant with God, Gods Attributes are imputed to us, nor doth he barely and simply say,
Gods

Gods Attributes are ours; but he explicates that saying in these words [that is, as to the benefit of them] so that there is just cause to think, that the Doctor of any man should rest satisfied with that explication, which others do give of such phrases, touching the manner of the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, or its being made ours, they saying of Christs Righteousness, as he says of Gods Attributes.

2. Though the Saints will own nothing, as the meritorious cause of their righteousness, pardon, or justification, but the Righteousness of Christ, nevertheless they may, and ought to own evangelical obedience (*i. e.*) their return to God in faith and repentance, as the *condition*, without which the said saving effect, or benefit of Christs Righteousness, shall not be theirs.

Where (by the way) observe the unjustifiableness of those *Antinomian* sayings of the Doctor, p. 118.

That Christ himself is the Righteousness, that he requires at our hands. And p. 166. It will one day appear, that God abhors the janglings of men, about the place of their own works and obedience, in the business of their acceptation with God.

To these sayings I reply;

1. Christ himself is our Righteousness, in such a sense as he is said to be our Life (*i. e.*) not in a formal, but in a causal sense, the predication in such Propositions not being *Formalis*, or *Essentialis*, but *Causalis*, as is the manner of Logicians to express such matters.

2. As it is not truly said in a literal, but only in a tropical sense, that Christ himself is our Righteousness, so it is not true in any sense (I know) to say, That Christ himself is the Righteousness, which

which he requires at our hands, neither do I remember any such saying in Scripture, but rather that Christs Righteousness or Obedience, was a thing required at his hands, and not at ours.

3. As Christs Righteousness was a thing required at his hands, so it is apparent by the Scriptures, that there is a personal evangelical Righteousness required at our hands, in order to our acceptance with God, by, through, or for the Righteousness sake of Christ, and without which evangelical Righteousness, the unrighteous shall not be accepted with God, *Mat. 5.20. and 25. last. 1 Cor. 6.9.*

4. It will one day appear, how God abhors the vain janglings (that I may not say also the jugglings) of men, who not perceiving, or acknowledging the consistency, or subordination of our own personal Righteousness to Christs, in the business of our acceptance with God, would thrust either of them out of their proper place (i. e.) either Christs Righteousness out of the place, or office of the alone meritorious cause, or our own evangelical Righteousness (i. e.) our return to God by faith and repentance, from the office or place of a condition of our acceptance. What God said to *Cain* (*Gen. 4.7. If thou dost well, shalt thou not be accepted?*) the same in effect doth God in his Gospel say to every sinner, *If thou dost well, (i. e.) If thou dost believe in Christ, if thou dost repent and convert, thou shalt be accepted through Christ; if otherwise, sin lies at the door, and will obstruct thy acceptance with God.*

Again, Observe from the premisses, the unreasonableness of that other saying of the Doctor, *p. 219. where having quoted 1 Cor. 1.30. he says, Not that Christ is this, or that part of our Acceptance with God,*

cepta-

ception with God, but he is all, he is the whole.

To this I answer, as the very truth is ;

1. Although Christ be the whole, and sole meritorious cause of our acceptation with God, yet he is not the whole, nor any the least part of our acceptation it self: For Christ being altogether a cause extrinsecal to our acceptation with God, he cannot possibly be any part of, or ingredient into the thing it self: For this were to make Christ to be a cause intrinsecal to it, and consequently either the formal, or material cause thereof (for these only are *Cause*, or *Partes Constitutivæ*, which do *Ingressi naturam rei*) neither of which he can be said to be, but the meritorious cause.

2. As was afore said, so I say again, That in order to our acceptation with God, both Christ hath his part, and we have our part to act, both of them being severally and joynly assigned us of God. So that if by the whole of our acceptation with God, the Doctor doth mean, that Christ and his Righteousness, is all that God requires, in order to our acceptation with him, his saying is to be rejected as false, and a branch of *Antinomian* doctrine.

3. I desire, that the foresaid distinction may the rather be observed, because it may serve to discover the malevolence, or in-sincerity, or at least (to speak most favourably, and with the utmost of charity) the *ignorance* of those, who say, That the dispute here is, Whether we are justified before the Just and Holy God, by our own righteousness, or by the Righteousness of a Mediator ?

|| In the
last Page
of the Pre-
face to
his Book.

These are the very words of the Author of the late Book styled, || *Anti-Sozzo*; who should either have had more wit to know, or more grace to acknowledge the contrary, *viz*,

That

That the Dispute between Protestant and Protestant is not, Whether sinners be justified before God, by their own Righteousness, or by the Righteousness of Christ our Mediator; but whether there be not also an evangelical Righteousness (consisting in a return to God by faith and repentance) required of every sinner, in order to his being justified, for the sake of Christ's Mediatory Righteousness, as the alone meritorious cause thereof.

And this is that, which however some Protestants do dispute, and seem to gainsay, yet others do not, but do professedly maintain; among whom I shall instance in the late Assembly of Divines, as appears by the Confession of their Faith and Catechism; they professing (*Ch. 15. Sect. 3.* of their Confession)

That although repentance be not to be rested in as a satisfaction for sin, or any cause of the pardon thereof, which is the act of Gods free grace in Christ, nevertheless it is of such necessity to all sinners, that none may expect pardon without it.

And as appears also by the express answer, which they do instruct every Catechumen to make unto this Question [What doth God require of us, that we may escape his wrath and curse due to us, by reason of the transgression of the Law?] the answer put into their mouths being this,

That we may escape the wrath and curse of God due to us, by reason of the transgression of the Law, he requireth of us repentance towards God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ, and—

I might also instance in the judgment of our own Church, touching the necessity of a personal Righteousness in sinners, that so they may be justified before God, through the Righteousness of Christ, or for his sake absolved from their sins.

This appears by the tenor of that discharge, or absolution, which after the general Confession in the Liturgy, every Minister is in Gods Name, and as his Commissioner, to pronounce, saying, *He pardoneth and absolveth all them that do truly repent, and — wherefore let us beseech him to grant us true repentance, and — so that at the last we may come to his eternal joy, through Jesus Christ our Lord.* I do well remember, that in the Scotch Liturgy, after the Petition, *That God would grant us true repentance, and his holy Spirit,* the following words are inserted (*That we may receive from him absolution from all our sins*) which insertion I never heard to have been challenged, by any of our *Scottish Brethren*, as holding forth any false, Popish, or un-Christian doctrine, nor do I know any colour of reason for such an accusation, or suspicion, albeit I do well know, That to pray to God to grant unto us true repentance, and his holy Spirit (*That we may receive from him absolution from all our sins*) is all one in effect, and the self same thing, as to pray to God to grant unto us those requests, *That we may be justified, or not condemned, but escape wrath to come.*

But forasmuch as Dr. O. is such a professed adversary, to all manner of set-Liturgies, for the carrying on of Gods publick Worship (as appears by what he hath written, p.296,297.) and forasmuch as I do not know, of what credit with him, an Assembly of Divines at *St. Peters-Westminster*, is more than a Convocation at *St. Pauls-London*, or what considerable valuation, he hath for either of them, I will not therefore urge him with the Authority of
either

either the one, or the other, nor indeed with any other Authority, but what I am most assured, he will own, and which indeed is all-sufficient for my purpose, viz. The divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures.

Having ended this Chapter, I shall now proceed to specify the next evil Consequence, of the said Imputation here disowned, which shall be the subject of the Chapter next ensuing.

CHAP. XXVI.

Another evil Consequence of the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, in the sense opposed, That God sees no sin in the Saints, all their sins being covered from the sight of God, by their being clothed with the Righteousness of Christ; the falsity of which is discovered, and certain Scriptures vindicated from their abuse. A reply to Dr. Owen, who denies, That it will follow, from the said Imputation of Christs Righteousness to us, that we are as perfectly righteous as Christ is.

ANother evil Consequence, of the said Imputation of Christs Righteousness to Believers, in the sense aforesaid is, That God sees no sin in them.

This seems to be an unavoidable Consequence of the former; for if Believers are as perfectly

righteous as Christ the Righteous, and more perfectly righteous, than if they had perfectly kept the whole Law in their own persons, and if they are in the sight of God, as the very Son of God himself, then doth it follow, that God sees no sin in them; for how can God see any sin in any person so perfectly righteous?

And this is that Consequent, which is owned by Mr. *Will. Eyre*, in his *Allize-Sermon* before cited, he saying, p.11.

The soul, that hath Christs Righteousness put upon him, by Gods gracious Imputation, hath all his sins covered and hidden from the sight of God, the eye of divine justice sees not the least spot of sin (Eph.5.27.) or iniquity in those, that are clothed with it, the Saints through his death are presented holy and unblameable, and unreproveable in his sight, Col. 1.22.

In answer hereunto, 1. I have in certain Chapters of my Exercitation, concerning the nature of forgiveness of sin, suggested several Rules, for a due interpretation of those Metaphorical phrases, whereby forgiveness of sin is expressed in Scripture, such as these (*Gods covering our sins, blotting them out, casting them behind his back, bidding his face from them*—) whereby is not meant a bare intuitive sight in God, but Gods not seeing our sins, so as to condemn us for them, or that the Saints shall no more be condemned for their sins, than if God did not see them, than if they were blotted out, covered, or hid from his sight. See *Ch.3.* and 4th. and 9th.

2. As for those fore-cited Scriptures, *Eph.5.27. Col.1.22.* they do indeed prove partly what Believers at present are, viz. That they are in a present state of reconciliation with God (reconciled, par-

pardoned, justified—) and partly what at last they shall be, that is, That they shall be presented perfectly holy, as a spouse in perfect beauty — But they do not prove, what Mr. Eyre doth insinuate, viz. That they are now so presented, or that God sees not the least spot of sin, or iniquity in them.

Quest. Do not some deny this and the former evil Consequence, of the said Imputation of Christs Righteousness?

Ans. Yes: For so indeed Dr. Owen in his Book styled, *Communion with God*, would seem to do; but with what success, may appear by my Reply to that his answer, which he makes to an Objection, both which I shall recite as I find them, p. 187.

Having asserted in the foregoing Pages, that Christs active obedience is reckoned, or imputed to Believers (mis-alledging, and mis-interpreting for that purpose several Scriptures, *Phil. 3. 9.* *2 Cor. 5. 21.*) he objecteth against it, and answers to it in the words following:

Object. But if this be so, then are we as Righteous as Christ himself, being Righteous with his Righteousness?

Ans. But first here is a great difference, if it were no more, than that this Righteousness was inherent in Christ, and properly his own, it is only reckoned and imputed to us, or freely bestowed upon us, and we are made righteous with that, which is not ours.

But secondly the truth is, that Christ was not righteous with that Righteousness for himself, but for us, so that there can be no comparison; only this we may say, We are righteous with his Righteousness, which he wrought for us, and that compleatly.

To this Answer I reply ;

1. That the difference here mentioned by the Doctor, and said to be Great, is indeed Small : For the difference is rather Modal, than Substantial, a difference rather *Quoad Modum*, than *Quoad veritatem rei*, I mean plainly, a difference about the manner, how Christs Righteousness was his own, and how it is Ours : For he doth acknowledge, that the self same individual Righteousness, which Christ wrought for us, is Ours, the only difference being in the *Modus*, or manner, how it was His, and how Ours (*i. e.*) His properly, inherently, or originally, Ours improperly, by Donation, Imputation, or at the second hand.

2. As the said difference is comparatively small, so it is nothing at all as to the matter in hand, or the purpose, for which it is alledged : For notwithstanding this Modal difference, if the self same individual Righteousness, which Christ wrought for us, be truly and substantially Ours, or in it self imputed to us, it will follow from thence unavoidably (as I think) that we are as righteous with Christs Righteousness, as Christ himself was with it.

3. Although it be true, that Christ was not righteous with that Righteousness for himself, but for us (*i. e.*) for our behoof, and that we might reap the fruit and benefit of it ; and although upon such a construction of his Righteousness, its being not for himself, but for us, there can be no comparison betwixt him and us ; nevertheless if the Doctor will allow us to say (as indeed he doth) that we are righteous with his Righteousness, which he wrought for us, and that compleatly, he must allow to others the comparison aforesaid, which

which they make to themselves, touching their being as perfectly righteous, as was Christ the Righteous, and that God sees no sin in them: For how should God see sin in them, who are compleatly righteous with that Righteousness, which Christ wrought for them, more than in Christ himself?

4. Though we forbear the comparison, yet granting (as the Doctor doth) that we may say positively, That we are righteous with his Righteousness, which he wrought for us, and that compleatly, it will from thence necessarily follow, that God sees no sin in us: For supposing Christs Righteousness to be a compleat Righteousness, (which we cannot suppose, except we suppose it to be without the least spot of sin) and supposing, that we are compleatly righteous, with that his spotless, sinless Righteousness, how it is possible for God to see sin in us, I do not understand, or can perceive.

Having been so large in the foregoing Chapters, touching the evil Consequences of the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, asserted in the sense aforesaid, I will be more brief in the rest.

C H A P. X X V I I.

Another evil Consequence of the said Imputation, That it leaves no place for remission of sin, in persons made so compleatly righteous, with Christs Righteousness, and that it doth utterly overthrow the true nature of Gospel-Justification, making the justification of a sinner to be quite another thing, and of another kind, than indeed it is. An Objection answered.

A Nother evil Consequence of the said Imputation of Christs Righteousness is, That it leaves no place for remission of sins, in persons made compleatly righteous with it.

It is certain, that God forgave Christ no sin: And the reason is obvious, because being perfectly righteous, he had no sin to be forgiven, according to that of St. *John* (1,3,5.) *And in him is no sin.* Now if men be righteous with the same sinless Righteousness, wherewith Christ was righteous, they have no sin to be pardoned, no more than he had. Whereas Remission of sin, as it is a saving benefit which we all have need of, and the great purchase of Christs blood, so it is that, which Christ hath taught Believers daily to pray for, even after and notwithstanding this Imputation of Christs Righteousness unto them (if any such thing were) except we will maintain, that our Saviour Christ composed that pattern of prayer, only for the use of Infidels and Unbelievers.

Now to ask Gods mercy in the forgiveness of
our

our sins, and yet to conceive our selves to be righteous, with the spotless Righteousness of Christ, and this compleatly, is rather to mock, or dissemble with God, than seriously and in good earnest to worship him, whom we pray unto.

Briefly, The said Imputation doth utterly overthrow the true nature of Gospel-Justification, or the justification of a sinner, which doth consist in the remission of his sins, as hath been already manifested: For a legal or perfect Righteousness, imputed to a person in the very formality thereof, doth not justify him by way of forgiveness of sins, but is of it self intrinsically and essentially his justification, and is such a kind of justification, as with which forgiveness of sins is not compatible: For what need hath he, who hath a legal Righteousness imputed to him, of forgiveness of sins, when-as such a Righteousness excludes all sin?

If it be objected, That a mans sins are first forgiven him, and then Christs perfect Righteousness is imputed to him, and so he is justified?

To this it hath been already answered;

1. That Christs Righteousness is no more, or otherwise imputed to a sinner, in order to his justification, than in order to the remission of his sin.
2. That a person, who is a sinner, is capable of no other kind of justification, than that, which is by, or doth consist in the remission of his sins.
3. That if a mans sins be forgiven him, he hath no need of any Imputation, of any further Righteousness for his justification: For when God hath given men their offences (according to that expression of the Apostle, *The free gift is of many offences unto justification*) that is, hath forgiven them, he hath

hath fully justified them. The Apostle in that expression [the gift of offences] alludes to that Metaphor of debts, under which notion our Saviour speaking of sin, did teach his Disciples to pray for the forgiveness thereof, to give a debt, and to forgive it, being all one, *Mat. 6. 12.*

Lastly, Whereas this Objection supposeth, that by the passive obedience of Christ, we have remission of sin, and by the Imputation of the active part of his obedience, we are justified, as I have already disproved it, and asserted withal, that the whole obedience of Christ [God-man] doth make up the meritorious cause of all saving benefits bestowed on us, so I add, If we will needs distinguish the effects of Christs active and passive obedience, after that manner, I cannot perceive, that it is any ways reasonable, to invert the order of these effects, and dispose of them thus *Ad placitum*, in a cross method to their several causes producing them, which some Authors presume to do, and in special *Dr. Owen* among others. Christ did not first die, and then keep the Law for us, but he first kept the Law, and then suffered death for us. Therefore if we will needs make the Imputation of the one, a distinct benefit from the other, reason (methinks) would, that *that* which is first purchased, should be first bestowed, or received, and consequently, that Imputation of Righteousness, should have a precedency in order, before remission of sin.

C H A P. XXVIII.

Another evil Consequence of the said Imputation, That it subverts the necessity of our repentance, in order to our salvation by Christ, that the non-necessity thereof in Believers, hath been asserted by some.

MR. Baxter having charged the opinion here impugned, as many ways subverting Christian Religion, for proof of that charge, I shall suggest to consideration, Whether in the consequence thereof, it doth not subvert the necessity of repentance and new obedience, in order to a sinners salvation by Christ.

To this end be it considered, how the matter is obvious to be argued, *e. g.* If *Adam* had kept the Law, he had needed no repentance more, than Christ himself needed it: Now, if upon the Imputation of Christs Righteousness unto us, in its essential nature, we may be said to have kept the Law in Christ, as exactly and perfectly as he did, what need of repentance have we, or can we have, more than the first, or the second *Adam*, Christ Jesus? For if the exact and perfect obedience of Christ, be the ground and reason, why Christ himself needed no repentance, and this obedience in all the exactness and perfection thereof, be as truly Ours by Imputation, as it was his, or as it could have been Ours by personal performance, how is it possible, that it being a sufficient ground, of a non-necessity of repentance in the one, it should not be the same in the other? Yea, if it be
true,

true, what hath been related, as owned by Mr. *Will. Eyre* and Mr. *S. Rols*, viz. That through the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, we are not only as perfectly righteous, but also more perfectly righteous, than if we our selves had fulfilled the whole Law, it must follow from thence (in all reason I think) that we have less need of repentance, than the first *Adam* ever had since his creation.

I have somewhere read (the story is told by Mr. *John Godwin*) that a certain Minister being pressed with this Argument , was thereby constrained to acknowledg to him, That Believers being perfectly righteous, through the said Imputation of Christs Righteousness, have no need of repentance.

And the self same thing was asserted by Dr. *Crispe*, Rector of *Brinkworth*, near me, as I have heard it related from the mouthes of two ear-witnesses (Mr. *Tho. Baily*, Minister of *Minal*, and Mr. *Nicholas Proffet*, Minister of *Malborough*, both of them Members of the late Assembly) and who gave me leave to publish it in Print (they professing themselves ready to attest the same.)

The story in short (for it is needless here to relate the circumstances thereof, as to the time when, place where, and company among whom, all which I did set down in writing) is this ;

The said Doctor being seriously, and not *Disputationis ergo* (as himself protested) maintaining the said assertion (That Believers have no need to repent of their sins) and being urged by them, with the example of *David's* repenting, for his horrid crimes of adultery and murder, he answered, That *David* did more, than he ought to have done, he being not so fully and clearly acquainted with Go-
spel-

spel-Priviledges , as we now under the New Testament are.

Thus we have heard the mischievous Consequence , of the said doctrine of Imputation, respectively to sin past , and as for the consequence thereof, respectively to future duty, the next Chapter will discover.

C H A P. X X I X.

Another evil Consequence of the said Imputation, That it overthrows the necessity of new obedience, in' order to a sinners being saved by Christ ; Whence it is, that divers Authors, whereof some are named, do assert, That Christians are not to do any good duties, that they may be saved. Several passages to this purpose in Dr. Owen's Book styled, (Communion with God) related , with Animadversions thereupon more at large.

THat the said opinion overthrows the necessity of new obedience, in order to a sinners salvation by Christ. If God doth impute a perfect, formal Righteousness to men [such as Christs was] what need can there be of personal holiness, in order to impunity ? For in the said case of Imputation, it must be supposed, that the rights and priviledges belonging to such a Righteousness, do accompany it in the Imputation ; so that the person, to whom such Imputation is made, stands really invested

invested and possessed of them: For otherwise God gives husks, shels, shadows, and empty titles, without the substance of benefit, and true honour.

Now one main Priviledg of a perfect, formal Righteousness, is to invest with a full and entire right to life, even of its own intrinsical and inherent worth.

Hereupon some Preachers do not stick to profess and teach, that there is nothing necessary to be done by sinners, That they may be saved by Christ; among whom I have observed Mr. *Thomas Shepheard*, of *New-England*, in his Book styled, *The Sincere Convert*, to be a prime one, he saying, *That sinners are not to do good duties (to repent and reform their sinful ways) that they may be saved, but for other ends, and That the doing of good duties, that they may be saved, is the way to be damned.*

And some years ago, I heard a certain Minister, (eminent in the repute of the Vulgar, for one of the most able and evangelical Preachers in the whole County where he lived) who preaching concerning those words of the Psalmist (*Pf. 8.1.*) and from thence having raised this doctrine, which was the subject of his whole Sermon, viz. *That Jesus Christ hath done marvellous things, and got himself the victory*; he did in the Application thereof, inform his Auditors in the first place, That there is nothing for the Saints to do (meaning, as he did interpret himself) *that the Saints have nothing at all to do for their salvation*: And he did blame people for thinking, That doing is the way to heaven, he only acknowledging, that we must do good duties, in the way of love and thankfulness to Christ, who hath done all for us, and hath get him-

himself the victory. But if it had been objected to this person, That we must not only fight, but through Gods help also in our own persons, get the victory, if we think to be crowned (according to that in *Rev. 2. 7.*) and if it had been further on the other hand objected, What need is there of the principles of Love and Gratitude in the Saints, seeing according to the doctrine of the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, here impugned, Love it self, and Gratitude it self, even the self same Love and Gratitude, which was in the Son of God himself, as well as other his graces, or gracious actings, are reckoned to them, and are theirs by Imputation, in the very letter, formality, or essential nature thereof. If, I say, such Objections had been put to the said Preacher, would they not have put him to a stand, think we?

And whether Dr. Owen be not of the same mind, with the two fore-named Authors in this point, viz. That we are not to do good duties for this end, that we may be saved, I shall leave the judgment thereof to the Reader, by the following passage, which I shall immediately recite, and then animadvert upon.

Dr. Owen, p. 185.

Christ yielded perfect obedience to the Law, but how did he do it? Purely, as it stood in that conditional, Do this, and live. He did it in the strength of grace he had received. He did it as a means of life, to procure life by it, as the tenor of a Covenant? Are we then freed from this obedience? Yes, but how far? From doing it in our own strength, for doing it for this end, That we may obtain life everlasting. It is vain, that some say confidently, that we must

must work for life. It is all one as to say, we are yet under the old Covenant; Fac hoc, &c vives; We are not freed from obedience, as a way of walking with God, but we are as a way of working to come to him.

Reply.

1. The Doctor in saying, That Christ yielded perfect obedience to the Law, seems to mean, That he did perfectly obey every Law of God, which we in our own persons should have obeyed; and I presume, that he would be understood to mean thus, for he says often and expressly, p.179. *That whatsoever was required of us by vertue of any Law, that Christ did, and fulfill'd.* And if this be his meaning (as it seems plainly to be) I must crave leave to gainsay, saying, That God did not require of Christ to do, and fulfil whatsoever was required of us, by vertue of any Law. There are things required of us, by vertue of divine Laws peculiar to us, and the doing whereof is inconsistent with the person of Christ, and office of his Mediatorship, and he did plainly refuse, when he was upon earth, to do some things, which some of us are by the Law of God obliged to do, because he was under no such Law for the doing of them.

2. The Doctor in saying [That Christ yielded perfect obedience to the Law, as it stood in that conditional, *Do this, and live*] doth seem to mean, That the Law, to which Christ yielded perfect obedience, was the Law and Covenant of works, made with *Adam*, and that as such he yielded obedience thereunto, whereas the Law to which Christ yielded perfect obedience, was the Law of Mediatorship, and a Law in that respect peculiar

peculiar to himself, there being but *one Mediator betwixt God and man, the man Christ Jesus.*

3. Whereas the Doctor says, That Christ yielded perfect obedience to the Law, as a Covenant of works, as a means of life, to procure life by it, as the tenor of a Covenant, I conceive no such thing to be true, but that the truth is, That Jesus Christ did yield perfect obedience to the Law of Mediatorship, or that (to speak in his own words) *he did finish the work, which God gave him to do*, as Mediator, whereby to purchase life for us, according to the tenor of another Law or Covenant (*i. e.*) the New Testament in his blood.

4. Although Christ hath freed us from obedience to the Law of *works*, as a Covenant of life, and from obeying it for this end, that we may obtain life everlasting, according to the tenor of that Covenant, nevertheless he hath not freed us from obeying the Law, or Covenant of *grace* for this end, that we may in so doing obtain everlasting life. It is not vain (as the Doctor censures) that some say, confidently, but it is the very truth of Scripture, which all should say with the most assured confidence, *That we must work, that according to the Law of grace we may have life?* For *Seek good and not evil, that ye may live*, says the Prophet *Amos*, ch. 5. 14. *Blessed are they that do his Commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life* (*i. e.*) life everlasting.

Rev. 22.
12.

5. The Doctor's charge is notoriously false and groundless to say, That to work for life, is all one as to say, We are under the old Covenant, *Fac hoc, & vives*. Is it all one to say, Do this (*i. e.*) perform perfect and perpetual obedience, that thou maist live, as to say, with St. Peter, *Repent*

M

and

and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out ? Or to say with the Prophets *Esay* and *Jeremy*, *Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and return to the Lord--Esay 55. 7, 8. And Jer. 4. 14. Wash thine heart from wickedness, that thou maiest be saved ?* Or to say with the Apostle, *So run, that ye may obtain ? obtain what ?* what less, than life everlasting, as appears by the Verse following, wherein he interprets himself ? *1 Cor. 9. 24, 25.*

6. Walking is in truth working ; our Christian walking is our Christian working, yea I will say, it is our Christian warring, fighting, running, wrestling, doing like the *Olympian Athleta*, even all that belongs to the Champions of Christ, God, Angels and Men being spectators. All these are comprized under the Metaphorical and Scriptural phrase of Walking with God.

7. As our obedience is a way of walking with God, so it is a way of working to come to him, nor are we more freed from obedience (evangelical obedience) as a way of working to come to God, than we are freed from it, as a way of walking with God.

8. Evangelical working or obedience, as it is the way of walking with God, so it is *eo nomine*, the way of coming to God, or that will (through the mercy of God in Christ) bring us to God ; and as the means must be used, that by the use thereof we may obtain the end, so are we [as well in reason as in conscience] to betake our selves to the way of walking with God, that therein, or thereby, we may be brought, or come to God.

I proceed to the examination of certain other passages to the same purpose, in the Doctor's fore-cited Book, wherein he says, p. 244.

There

There being an impossibility of obtaining life by the Law, we are exempted from it as to any such end, and that by the Righteousness of Christ, Gal. 3. 21, 22, 23.

To this I answer, By the *Law* in that Scripture is meant the Mosaical Law, by the perfect obedience whereof, there was indeed an impossibility, for any persons of obtaining life, or justification unto life: But this doth not prove, that there is any impossibility of obtaining life by the Law of the Gospel, or that we are exempted from it as to any such end.

2. It is the promise of God in Christ first made to *Adam*, Gen. 3. 15. and afterwards renewed to *Abraham*, and which promise is specified, v. 16, 17. by which sinners are exempted from absolutely perfect obedience to any Law of God, to this end that they thereby may have life.

3. Although by the Righteousness of Christ, (included in that promise) sinners were exempted from the said perfect obedience to any Law, to this end that they may have life, nevertheless sinners are not upon any account whatsoever, exempted from sincere obedience, to this end that they may have life, according to the tenor of the Gospel-promise, wherein life is promised to those, and only those, who perform the condition thereof.

What the Law of Moses, or of Works could not do, the Law of the Gospel (through the mercy of God in Christ) can do, (i. e.) the condition thereof being kept, it can save sinners.

The Doctor proceeds to say in the following Page 245.

There be Gibeonites, outwardly attending the family of God, that do the service of his house, as the drudgery of their lives, the principle they yield obedience upon, is a Spirit of bondage unto fear, Rom. 8. 15. the rule they do it by, is the Law in its dread and rigour, exacting it of them to the utmost, with-

out mercy and mitigation, the end they do it for, is to fly from the wrath to come, to pacifie conscience, and seek righteousness, as it were by the works of the Law.— The Saints obedience is a free obedience, without fear, terror, bondage and constraint, they go forth unto all holy obedience in Christ.

Ans^r. 1. What opinion the Doctor hath of the Gibeonites, literally or properly so called, I know not ; but certain I am, that he had no cause to use their name as here he doth, in the way of reproach and disgrace, either because they were *Gibeonites*, or because they did the meaner sort of services belonging to the Tabernacle, one of the meanest whereof holy *David* did value at a high rate.

2. It is against reason to say, that there are, or ever were any such *Gibeonites*, in that full character, whereby they are here described by the Doctor : For if sinners apprehend no other rule of their actings, than the Law in its dread and rigor, exacting of them to the uttermost, without mercy and mitigation, it is more rational to conceive, that they should lye down in utter despair, than to drudge or trudge to no purpose. Otherwise I cannot perceive the sence of the Psalmist's reasoning, he saying, *There is mercy with thee ; therefore shalt thou be feared*, Psal. 130. 4.

3. They are not *Gibeonites* necessarily (in the Doctor's disgraceful sence) but they may be true *Israelites*, who do Gods service, that they may escape wrath to come, and enjoy peace of conscience here ; nor is any Christian the less an *Israelite*, or in truth the less a *Nathaneel*, because he serves God upon account of the reward promised thereunto, it having the promises both of the life that now is, and of that which is to come, 1 Tim. 4. 8.

4. The

4. The Doctor doth ill to jumble things together, as synonymous and homogeneous, which are exceeding disparate (I mean, the doing Gods service as the drudgery of our lives, and the doing thereof for this end, to fly from the wrath to come) nor indeed are these two things consistent: For those, who do regard Gods service as the assured way, or means of escaping wrath to come, and do accordingly serve God for that end, cannot in reason possibly be conceived to look upon, or account Gods service as the drudgery, but rather as the felicity of their lives, and in such sort as St. Paul did account of all his, both active and passive service of God in Christ, viz. no way comparable to the reward of escaping hell, and obtaining heaven, Rom. 8. 18.

5. It is the Doctors error to insinuate, that they who serve God for this end to fly wrath to come, do serve him upon the principle of that spirit of bondage intended by the Apostle in Rom. 8. 15. Yea by his insinuating the said Principle to be slavish, base, or unlawful, he doth as much as in him lies, bring the souls of men under a spirit of bondage, causing them to doubt of their being servants of God, yea to accuse themselves as none of his servants, because they serve him for this end, to fly from wrath to come; and also provoking them to such a manner of doing things, as being not required by God in his word, is not part of true Religion, but meer superstition, yea such things as are impossible in nature, as if we should perswade men to put off humanity, or not to be men. So that I may well say to those Readers, or Hearers of the Doctor, who can swallow, applaud, or approve such sayings as these in his Book, as St. Paul said of the seduced Corinthians, perverted by

their false Teachers, 2 Cor. 11. 20. *ye suffer if a man bring you into bondage, if a man devour you*; I may truly say, That the yoke, which the Doctor would here put upon the neck of Christs Disciples, is heavier than the yoke of Ceremonies, and such as neither we, nor our Fathers, nor successors, were, are, or ever shall be able to bear.

6. The obedience of the Saints may be a free obedience, although they do not go forth thereunto altogether without fear, and terror; and it's very ill done of this Author to insinuate the contrary. *Noah* went forth with fear to the obedience of God in building the Ark, which he did at Gods command, *et c.* *complan* (says the Text) to or for the saving of himself and family, Heb. 11. 7. And it is not to be doubted, but that fear (among other considerations) did make *David* to run the way of Gods Commandments, Psal. 119. 32. for what construction otherwise can be made of his saying in the same Psalm v. 120. *My flesh trembleth for fear of thee, and I am afraid of thy judgments*? And so it did holy *Job*, as appears Job 31. 23.

7. Judge Reader, whether it be not a great fault in the Doctor, so to misapply that Scripture Rom. 9. 32. and to pervert the sense thereof, as to make a Christians serving of God to fly from wrath to come, to be a seeking for righteousness as it were by works of the Law: for to seek righteousness by works of the Law, is to seek justification or salvation by the external observances of the Judaical Law, and consequently in a wrong way (opposite to the true Gospel-way of serving God) and not by faith in Christ, as the Apostle doth plainly interpret the matter in the self same verse. How unreasonably therefore doth the Doctor here insinuate,

sinuate, That those Christians, who seek righteousness by faith in Christ (the right Gospel-way) that is, do serve God and live Christian lives, that they may be justified for the righteousness sake of Christ, or be saved from wrath to come through his merits, that those, I say, who do serve God like Christians to that end, do take such a fatal course, as those Jews did, of whom the Apostle there speaks, saying, That Jesus Christ was a stumbling block to them, That they fell short of attaining the end, they aimed at (righteousness, justification, salvation) because they sought this saving happiness in a wrong way, and not by due means, (*i.e.*) not by faith in Christ, or works of the Gospel, but by external legal works, as inconsistent with the faith of Christ incarnate, as is Judaism and Christianity.

8. Forasmuch as the Doctor doth in express words assert p. 213. *That God hath appointed, that holiness shall be the means, the way to that eternal life, which as in it self and originally is his gift by Jesus Christ, so with regard to his constitution of our obedience as the means of attaining it, is a reward* — And again lb. *That it is the way appointed of God for us to walk in, for the obtaining of salvation.* These assertions of the Doctor, I say, being considered, I must needs say these two things:

First, I am not able to reconcile the Doctor with that forefaid Preacher, who in his Sermon upon *Psal. 98. 1.* did reprove people for thinking, That well-doing was the way to heaven.

Secondly, Nor am I able to reconcile the Doctor with himself in his acknowledging holiness to be Gods appointed way and means for the obtaining of eternal happiness, and yet making it the

The Doctor says well and truly, that well-doing is the way to heaven. but that other Preacher says no, it is not.

part and property of a Gibeonite (*i.e.*) a thing reprovable, a slavish, or disgraceful thing in a Christian to serve God to fly from wrath to come; for what is it to fly, or escape from wrath to come, but to obtain salvation? And what therefore is it to serve or obey God to fly from wrath to come, but to serve God to obtain salvation? and why should we not take the way, or use the means to obtain the end? or why did God constitute such and such things as means for such and such ends, but that, as by him they were appointed, so by us they should be used to attain the same?

But for all this the Doctor doth so spite at the Gibeonites, who are contented to do the meanest services, which God puts them to, that so they may escape the wrath of God in their own Consciences here, and in the flames of Hell hereafter. I say, he doth so detest the whole race of the said Gibeonites, as to sling another stone at them in a few pages after, whose words I shall recite, as I find them pag. 248. and with a few Animadversions thereupon I will conclude this Chapter.

The Saints motive to obedience is love — The rule of their obedience (their walking with God) is the Law of liberty, as divested of all its terrifying, threatening, damning, cursing power, and rendred in the blood of Christ Jesus, sweet, tender, useful, directing, helpful as a rule of walking in the life they have received, not the way of working for the life they have not. These instances may suffice to manifest that liberty of obedience in the family of God, which his sons and daughters have, that the poor convinced Gibeonites are not acquainted withall,

Answer,

Ans. 1. As hope and fear are well consistent with love, so are those as well as this the motive of the Saints obedience; and so they ought to be, as in part hath been already proved, as to fear in *Noah*, *Job* and *David*, and as is easily proveable, even by the current of the Scriptures both of the Old and New Testament. See *Heb.* 4. 1, & 12, 28, 29. *Rom.* 11. 20. *Phil.* 2. 13. And as for hope, its being a principle or motive of the Saints obedience, see *Act.* 26. 7. 1 *Joh.* 3. 3. 1 *Pet.* 1. 13, 14, 15. To multiply Scriptures for the proof of this, which is so evident in *nature*, is as needless as to light a candle at noon day. As he that ploweth, is moved to do it with hope of a crop, every other labourer with hope of some gain, 1 *Cor.* 9. 10. so are the Saints moved, and to be moved with the hope of the Gospel to be stedfast to it, and im- 1 *Cor.* 15. moveable from such a conversation as doth become 58. it.

2. It is not the Law of God as *diversed* of all its *terrifying, threatening, damning, cursing power*, which is the rule of the Saints obedience. Such doctrine is a branch of what Dr. *More* stiles that loathsome and pestilential error of *Antinomianism*, and indeed it is a root, which (of it self) beareth gall and wormwood, and therefore by all due means to be eradicated out of Gods husbandry, (the hearts and minds of his people) where the Devil (that envious one) hath planted it. And for the extirpation thereof, or confutation of this dangerous piece of *Antinomianism*, what need I say more, than to desire the Reader to open his Bible and to read the tenour of the Laws of God given by him as the rule of every ones living (I mean both as the directing and obliging rule) and then to speak his mind, whether the Law of God
(the

(the rule of the Saints obedience) hath not the usual Sanction of Laws (*i.e.*) a commination of terror, even the terrible curse of damnation, upon supposition of their disobedience thereunto. Doth not God command the Saints to beware of Apostasie, and to persevere in faith and holiness upon peril of damnation, *Ezek.* 18.24. *Rom.* 8.13. *Heb.* 4.1, & 10.

3. It is the Doctors error (as of many others) to think, that the Law of God cannot be sweet, tender, useful, directing, helpful to the Saints as a rule of walking with God, except it be divested of its sanction, as aforesaid: for although its sanction be supposed, will not the Saints say, as did *H Ezekiah* in another case, *Good is the word of the Lord, which he hath spoken?* *Esa.* 39.8. Yea, are not the very comminations of God useful and helpful (even of their own nature and proper tendency) to the Saints in their walking with God, as well as his precepts, or directions? He that denies this, which is so proveable, both by Scripture and reason, is worthy to be taught as *Gideon* taught the men of *Succoth*, with briars and thorns of the wilderness, I mean, to be confuted with stripes, rather than with words or arguments.

4. It seems, this Doctor hath not sufficiently studied the reason, why Gods Law (the Law of the Gospel) is styled a *Law of Liberty*: for if he had, he might have known, that it is so styled for *this* reason (among several others) because it imposeth no servile yokes like those laid upon the Jews, and enjoineth only such services as are suited and most agreeable to our rational nature, and in the performance of which consisteth our truest freedom and liberty.

5. It is another branch of *Antinomian* doctrine to say, *That the Law of God is a rule of the Saints walking, in the life they have received, not the way of working, for the life they have not.* This is an error, which as it hath been abundantly confuted by Mr. Baxter, in several of his Writings, so I have already refuted in this Chapter, and more at large in the 28th. Chapter of my Exercitation, concerning the nature of Forgiveness of sin, where-in is manifested the consistency of these two (working From and For life) and that the Saints, from the life of grace they have received, do work and ought to work For the life of glory, which as yet they have not received.

Lastly, While the Doctor pretends to maintain that liberty of obedience, in the family of God, which (as he says) the sons and daughters of God have, he makes them worse slaves, than the *Gibeonites* were ever made by *Joshua*. Now alas for the poor convinced *Gibeonites*! these poor convinced unconvinced *Gibeonites*! convinced in conscience, that it is their duty to serve God, but not convinced, that it is their sin to serve Him to this end, to fly from wrath present in a wounded conscience, or from wrath to come, in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone! Convinced, that it is their duty to love God, but not convinced, that the love of God, and the love of their own souls, are things inconsistent! Convinced, that a main motive of their serving God, should be their love of Him, but not convinced, that love to their souls-safety and salvation, should be no motive at all unto, or end of their serving of God! I will say to these poor *Gibeonites*, who cannot so easily put off humanity, or be perswaded out of all love to themselves, specially to their
souls,

souls, Let it be a very small thing with you, to be judged of this mistaken Doctor, yea to be judged by mans judgment; for he that will judg you at the last is the Lord, who will judg your present Judges, who pass such an harsh judgment upon you. But be of good chear: For if to be moved to serve God for this end, to fly from wrath present and to come, be to be made indeed a *Gibeonite*, then for your comfort be it known to you, that St. Paul was a *Gibeonite*; for he was induced to preach the Gospel, upon consideration of that Woe, that did hang over his head, if he did not preach it, *1 Cor. 9. 16.* And he did mortifie the deeds of the flesh, lest himself having preached to others, should at last prove to be a cast-away, *1 Cor. 9. 27.* Yea he professeth for others as well as himself, that the end of all his and their Christian strivings, was to obtain for themselves an incorruptible Crown, *v. 25.* Briefly, as David said to scoffing Micol (*I will yet be more vile*) so let us resolutely answer to the iterated scoff of this Doctor, If to do as aforesaid be indeed to be a *Gibeonite*, In the Name of God let there be more *Gibeonites*, Let them be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the Church.

There are many other dangerous evils, which do naturally flow from the Imputation of Christs righteousness, in the sense here opposed; but because I have enlarged my self in the premises beyond my first intention, I will not so much as mention them. I will only conclude this long Chapter with the words of Mr. Truman in his Book styled (*The great Propitiation*, p. 94, 95.) wherein he suggestieth that mischievous consequence of the Imputation of Christs righteousness, which hath in
this

this Chapter been specified and insisted upon; and I do the rather think meet to transcribe the words of that Author, because some Readers may peradventure regard them as proceeding from his Pen, rather than mine; for notwithstanding every way, whether by means of one Author or another, (my labour of love in this Treatise, or the labours of any other in theirs) so the truths of the Gospel be entertained, I desire to be affected as was the Apostle, saying in another case, *I therein do rejoice, yea and will rejoice, Phil. 1. 18.*

If Christ (says that Author) fulfilled the Law for us in this sence, so as it is to be imputed to us, as if we had fulfil'd the Law our selves, then we should be freed altogether from any obligation from the Law to obedience, just as we are freed from the condemnation of the Law, because Christ underwent it as a satisfaction for us, we should not then sin in not obeying the Law, and we could not be pardoned by Christ for our sins in not obeying the Law; for they are no sins according to this Hypothesis. If there be a Law, that if a servant hired for a year, shall refuse to serve his years service (if his Master require) he shall lye in the prison for a year. Suppose one hired did not serve a year, but another served a year good and faithful service for him, must this hired man also serve a year for himself, or he is too blame? and must this man accepted to serve a year for him also, lie in prison for him? What if I did not serve a year, yea another served for me, and better service than I can perform? What need is there may he say, that I should serve it my self? Do I think, I can mend his work, do it better my self, than I have done it in him? I am almost ashamed to lay open the weakness of them that hold these things, after such multitudines

titudes of learned Protestants have shewn their absurdity.

The other two Arguments of this Author in the same and the precedent page, are for the weightiness of them well worthy to be here transcribed; but I shall refer the Reader to the perusal thereof in his Book it self.

CHAP.

C H A P. X X X.

Q. *May Believers be truly or fitly said to be clothed with the Robe of Christs Righteousness, or the like form of words? Four Reasons why the said Question is proposed and answered. The Answer it self.* 1. That there are no such express sayings in Scripture, nor any Scripture, wherein Christs Righteousness is set forth under the Metaphor of Rayment. 2. That our own personal Righteousness in the several branches thereof, doth go under the Metaphorical expressions of Robes, comely rayment, and splendid array. Several Scriptures, objected to the contrary, answered. In what sence 'tis true, and in what, false, to say, that we are clothed with the Robe of Christs Righteousness: And that it is more fitly and intelligibly said, that it purchaseth or procureth Clothing for us, than that it is it self our Clothing.

Q. *MAY Believers be truly, or fitly said to be clothed with the Robe of Christs Righteousness? To have Christs Righteousness put upon them? That their persons, or sins are covered with the Righteousness of Christ, or the like expressions?*

Ans. I have thought meet to propose, and make answer to this Question, for three or four Reasons;

1. Because such expressions have been very usual

usual in the Sermons and Books of some Divines.

2. Because the mis-understanding of the true sense, wherein Christs Righteousness is imputed to us, and the asserting of a sense contrary to truth, hath been (I doubt not) the sole cause, or occasion of such expressions, one un-scriptural phrase frequently begetting another, and the daughter doth sometimes happen to be more deformed, than the mother.

3. Because such expressions have occasioned strange and gross conceptions in the minds of many people, as if by the Righteousness of Christ put upon them, by Gods Imputation, all their sins were so covered and hidden from the sight of God, as that the eye of divine justice sees not the least spot of sin in those, who are cloathed with it. Such sayings as these have been already recited out of certain Writers.

4. Because several Scriptures have been very frequently perverted, to countenance or authorize such expressions, which I will therefore take occasion to vindicate, whereby to restore them to their true sense and meaning.

I shall therefore return a more copious Answer to the said Question, and say;

1. I do not remember any place in all the Bible, where the said expressions are used, or where Christs Righteousness is mentioned under the Metaphor of a Robe, or Garment, which Believers are to put on, or wherewith they are, or are to be clothed. I do indeed well remember the Scripture, where Christ is set forth [his flesh and blood] under the Metaphor of food [meat and drink] but no place, where his Righteousness is mentioned under the notion, or Metaphor of Rayment.

2. But

2. But on the other side, I find many places of Scripture, where our own personal righteousness, (even in the several branches thereof) doth go under the said Metaphorical expressions; for which see *Job 29.14. I put on righteousness, and it clothed me. My judgment was as a robe and a diadem.* What righteousness doth *Job* there mean? surely not Christ's Righteousness, but his own (as appears both by the precedent and subsequent verses, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17.--) viz. Justice, pity, mercy, and the like virtues. *Col. 3.12. Put on as the elect of God bowels of mercies, kindness--Eph. 4.22, 23. Put off concerning the former conversation the old man--and v.24. Put on that new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness. 1 Pet. 5.5. Be ye clothed with humility.* Our own righteousness in the several branches thereof is that, which in many Scriptures is commended to us under the notion of splendid rayment, which adorns us, makes us lovely in the eyes of God, and which is in *his sight of great price*; 1 Pet. 3.3, 5. 1 Tim. 2.9, 10. To this purpose I might instance in many sayings out of the *Proverbs of Solomon*, were it needful.

But soasmuch as several Scriptures are objected to the contrary, of what hath been here said in the first branch of my Answer, I will therefore specify some of the chief of them, and reply thereunto.

Object. *Rev. 3. 18. What else is meant by the white rayment there mentioned, but the Righteousness of Jesus Christ?*

Answer. 1. The Question may as well be demanded, What is meant by the Gold there spoken of, but the Righteousness of Christ? For we are not otherwise clothed with the robe or rayment, than

N

we

we are enriched with the gold of Christs Righteousness.

2. By the white rayment, is there meant our own righteousness, consisting of such gracious dispositions, and works of holiness, which do adorn the Disciples of Christ in his sight, more than the most Lilly-white, and splendid rayment, doth the greatest Princes in the eye of men. And this I conceive to be meant by that rayment of needlework, wherein the Bride (the Lambs wife) is said to be brought unto him, *Pf. 45. 13, 14.* And this is that righteousness of the Saints, wherewith
 ¶ *Rev. 19.* they are said to be ¶ arrayed, as in fine linnen,
 8. clean and white; righteous works being that rayment, wherewith every Christian (man and woman) should be clothed, or adorned, *1 Tim. 2. 10.*

Object. Rom. 13. 14. Are not Christians there commanded to put on the Righteousness of Christ?

Ans. 1. Whatever be the thing, which the believing *Romans* are there commanded to put on, I am perswaded, that the Apostles meaning there is, That we should put it on not as a garment, but rather as Armour, we being as well said to put on this, as that. He prosecutes that Metaphor mentioned, *v. 12.* [Put on the Armour of light.]

2. Consequently I think, that we have no more reason to conclude, that by the garment, which we are there commanded to put on, is meant Christs Righteousness, than that his Righteousness is it, which under the Metaphor of the Armour of light, we are commanded to put on in the verse next before. But I am content, that the Reader judg of them.

3. I know no surer way rightly to understand, what the Apostles true meaning was [That we should put on] than by considering what we should put off. Now forasmuch as the things, which he would have us put off, are what he styles the works of darkness (*i. e.*) wicked works of all sorts, especially such as are there named, I may therefore safely (I doubt not) conclude, That by our putting on the Lord Jesus Christ, he means our putting on the graces, or vertues of the Lord Jesus Christ, these being the image of our Lord Christ; and it being ordinary to call the image of a thing, or person, by the name of the person or thing, which it doth resemble. And in this sence the word [Christ] is used, *Gal. 4. 19. My little children, of whom I travel in birth again, till Christ be formed in you.*

Object. *Gal. 3. 27. Doth not the Apostle there mean, that the Galatians having been baptized into Christ, had put on the Righteousness of Christ?*

Ans. By Christ there is not meant the Righteousness of Christ; and what is the very thing there meant by the Apostle, that the baptized *Galatians* had put on, I know no surer way to understand, than by considering the scope of the Apostle in that Epistle, what it was, that he would have them to put off. Now that, which the Apostle in this Epistle especially would have the *Galatians* to put off, was Judaism, in all the parts of it as such. So that as by the Lord Jesus Christ in *Rom. 13. 14.* is meant Christianity, in opposition to Gentilism, or those heathenish vices there specified, so by Christ in *Gal. 3. 27.* I conceive is meant Christianity, or the practice of Christian Religion, in opposition to Judaism. *As many of you as have been bap-*

tized into Christ, have put on Christ, not Moses, you have taken upon you the profession of Christian Religion, not that of the Jewish, or Mosaical Law.

Object. *Is not Christs Righteousness the thing it self meant by the wedding garment ? Mat. 22.12.*

Ans. No, but those holy qualifications, and gracious dispositions, wherewith a Christian should attend upon God in his sacred Ordinances, and in his solemn approaches to God, should be vested with, even as men upon festival occasions, do apparel themselves in rayment suitable thereunto.

Object. *Is not the Righteousness of Christ that garment of salvation, and robe of righteousness, wherewith God is said Esa. 61. 10. to have clothed, or covered his Church ?*

Ans. It were easie to name many Authors, who have perverted that Scripture to such a sence; whereas the truth is, that there is no more cause to think, that the Righteousness of Christ is meant by the garment there mentioned, than where mention is made of the same word by the Prophet elsewhere (Ch. 52. 1.) saying, *Awake, awake, put on thy strength O Zion, put on thy beautiful garments O Jerusalem.* The very truth of the matter is ;

1. As the words are a promise (although after the manner of Gods speaking by his Spirit in the Prophets, it is expressed in the preterperfect tense) and as the good promised is expressed by the name of *Salvation and Righteousness* (these in effect being one thing) so by Righteousness is meant Gods beneficence and bounty, with the several fruits of it confer'd upon his Church, in their preservati-

ons,

ons, deliverances, restorations — In this sence the word [Righteousness] is frequently taken in Scripture, *Hos. 10. 12. It is time to seek the Lord, till he come and rain Righteousness upon you. Ps. 24. 5. He shall receive Righteousness from the God of his salvation*; so that there is no more cause to affirm, That by Righteousness in *Esa. 61. 10.* is meant Christs personal Righteousness, than to make the same construction of the word in the places fore-cited, where God promiseth to rain Righteousness upon them, or that they shall receive Righteousness from him, as the God of their salvation.

2. As for the Metaphorical expression, of being clothed and covered with the garment of salvation, and robe of righteousness, it is an allusion to the custom of the Jews (and indeed of all Nations) which was to clothe and attire themselves suitably to their present condition, whether of prosperity, or adversity, fasting or feasting times, as is expressed *v. 3.* of that Chapter in these words (*To appoint to them, that mourn in Zion, to give unto them beauty for ashes, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness*) So that by the whole of that expression, we can understand no more, than the great goodness and bounty of God (let the particulars in the retail thereof, whether in temporals or spirituals, or in both, be what they will) promised, or manifested to his Church, and manifested by them, in a suitable manner of open and solemn rejoicing for them.

Quest. *May it not be truly said in some sence, that Believers are clothed with Christs Righteousness?*

Ans. Yes: Yet more fully be it known, that as it may be truly and falsely said, that Christs

Righteousness is imputed to us [according to the different senses of the word Righteousness, mentioned in the third Chapter] so it is both true and false to say, That we are clothed with the Righteousness of Christ, *e. g.* Christs Righteousness being taken properly in its essential nature, it is notoriously false to say, that we are clothed therewith : For so taken, it is Christs own clothing, and not ours, he is glorious in this apparel, and he will not give this his glory to another ; and as *Saul's* Armour would not fit *David*, so neither will Christs Righteousness [taken in this sense] suit with any other but himself, who was God and man in one person. As it is a point of disloyalty in a vassal, to put on the Ensigns of Majesty upon himself (The Crown Royal upon his head——) so it is a disloyal thought, a most unbecoming thing, for a wretched sinner to imagine himself vested with the Royal Robe of Christs Righteousness, the only begotten Son of God. But as the word Righteousness is taken improperly, *Effective*, for the fruits and effects of it, so it is true to say, That we are clothed with his Righteousness (*i. e.*) we are clothed, our spiritual nakedness is covered, we are arrayed with a garment, or garments, procured or purchased with the Righteousness of Jesus Christ. So that, if the Question were thus formed, *May Christs Righteousness be truly said to be a sinners clothing ?* It must be answered, That this Proposition [Christs Righteousness is a sinners clothing] is true *Prædicatione causali*, but not *Essentiali*, or *formali* (*i. e.*) it is self, or in it self, is not our clothing, nor are we vested in, or with it, but with the fruits of it, it being the meritorious cause, that hath procured all necessary clothing for the covering of our nakedness, for our com-

fortable appearance before God, and our gracious acceptance with him ; which clothing may summarily be refer'd (I think) to these two heads, *viz.* Justification and Sanctification, both which may be said to be our clothing. Nevertheless I do judg it to be more fitly and intelligibly said, That our sins are covered with a pardon, rather than with Christs Righteousness, the one being verified in an immediate sence, the other in a sence more remote both in it self, and from common understanding. But it must ever be remembred, that the pardon which covers our sins, is a blessing purchased by the Righteousness of Christ ; and for that reason, in such a sence as a ransomed Captive, or bought Servant, is said to be his Masters, or Redeemers money, because he was bought with their money, in a like sence may the clothing, wherewith we are clothed, be said to be the Robe of Christs Righteousness, because Christs Righteousness was the price, wherewith that our clothing (whatsoever it be, be it sanctification or justification, grace or glory ; for even with this Believers are said to be clothed upon, 2 Cor. 5. 2, 4.) was dearly bought or purchased. And in this sence the price, or hire it self, which is given for an House, is used to signifie the House, wherewith it was hired, as appears by *Act. 28. 30.* where the *μισθωον*, which doth properly signifie the hire of a thing (be it of an House, or ought else) and which was given by St. Paul, or some other in his behalf, is styled, His own hired House.

C H A P. X X X I.

Dr. Owen's mistake in thinking, That when all sin is answered for, all the Righteousness, which God requireth for that time, is not fulfilled ; the contrary whereunto is proved. Several other of his mistakes discovered, and his mis-interpretations of several Scriptures.

FOrasmuch as there are several passages in Dr. Owen's Book, of Communion with God, wherein the contrary is asserted, to what hath been maintained in the foregoing Chapters (he asserting, That over and above the taking away the guilt of sin, it is necessary in order to our being saved, that we should be actually righteous, and for that purpose, that the Righteousness of Christ should be imputed to us) I shall therefore think it not amiss, to recite the chief of those passages, and to reply thereunto, which shall be the subject of three or four of the ensuing Chapters.

The Doctor having told us, That Christ satisfies for sin, and procures the remission of it, p. 116. he proceeds to say in the following page ;

There is something more required ; it is not enough, we are not guilty. We must also be actually righteous : Not only all sin must be answered for, but all righteousness is to be fulfilled : By taking away the guilt of sin, we are as persons innocent, but something more is required, to make us to be considered as persons obedient. I know nothing to teach me, that an innocent person shall go to heaven, be rewarded, if
be

be be no more, but so. Adam was innocent at his first creation, but he was to do this, to keep the Commandments before he entred into life, he had no title to life by innocency. This then moreover is required, that the whole Law be fulfilled, and all the obedience performed, that God requires at our hands. This is the souls second enquiry, and it finds a resolution only in the Lord Christ: For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life; his death reconciled us, then are we saved by his life. The actual obedience, which he yielded to the whole Law of God, is that Righteousness, whereby we are saved. If so be we are found in him, not having our own righteousness, which is of the Law, but the Righteousness, which is of God by faith, Phil. 3.9. This I shall have occasion to handle more at large hereafter.

Ans. Somewhat to this purpose being alledged by other Authors, hath been already answered in Chap. 23. Nevertheless I shall here make reply, to every distinct passage in the words recited.

1. When all sin is answered for, all the righteousness, which God requireth for that time, is fulfilled: For the Law is fulfill'd two ways, viz. Either by performance of perfect obedience to it, or by suffering sufficient punishment for the breach of it. Either of these is a satisfaction to the justice of God. Now Gods Law doth not bind to both these *Copulative* (i. e.) it binds not a person to both these at once, but *Disjunctive* (i. e.) it binds him to obedience, or to punishment, primarily and absolutely to the one, secondarily and *Ex hypothesi* (i. e.) upon failure of that obedience, to the other. Neither was Adam before his fall,
nor

nor are we since bound to both at once; not we, I say, more than was *Adam*: For satisfaction being made for our crime, we cease to be sinners, and do become righteous in this sense, that we are no longer bound to suffer, and we are entitled to a right of being dealt with as righteous: We are indeed bound to obedience for the future, not to that obedience, for the not performing whereof, by punishment we have made satisfaction, but to another new obedience, which if we do not perform, then are we bound by the Law to new punishment. So that Christ having obliged himself to make satisfaction, by suffering such punishment as was equivalent to that, which by our sins was deserved, and our sins being pardoned for the merit-sake thereof, we thereupon are dealt with as righteous; and for the future we are bound to new obedience, or to new punishment, not to both at once, no more than was *Adam* in innocency. The Law requireth not of us both suffering and obedience, in respect of the same time, and actions.

The consideration of this makes it most apparent, that if sin be pardoned, the Imputation of Christ's active Righteousness, or the Righteousness of the life of Christ (as is the Doctor's expression) is needless. And it is to no purpose to alledge, that the Law requires suffering for the time past, and obedience for the future, which hath been acknowledged: For Christ hath made satisfaction for future sins, and ere long those future sins will be past, and if we do not obey for the future, we sin, and if we sin, the Law requireth only our suffering for expiation, and forasmuch as Christ's expiatory suffering, or propitiation hath satisfied for that, the benefit whereof a sinner doth enjoy in a renewed

ed pardon, he is no longer obliged to suffer. So that the contrary opinion, to what I here maintain, doth in the consequence thereof deny, that Christ hath satisfied for future sins.

2. It is a palpable error in the Doctor to say, That by taking away the guilt of sin, we are as persons innocent, but something more is required to make us to be considered as persons obedient : For so much as sin is as well of omission, as of commission, it follows unavoidably, that if the guilt of the former be taken away, as well as of the latter, it is impossible, but that a sinner so pardoned should be considered, and dealt with as obedient ; for not to transgress the Law, and to fulfil the Law, are the same thing, as is easily proveable by the contrary : For to transgress the Law, is to violate it by doing what it forbids, or by omitting what it commands ; *Ergo*, Not to transgress the Law, is not to violate it, either by committing the one, or omitting the other ; and what is this, but to fulfil the Law ? For he, that doth neither commit the evil forbidden by the Law, nor omit the good therein commanded, doth fulfil it.

In short I say, 1. That an innocent person shall doubtless go to heaven, and be rewarded, though he be no more than so.

2. I am not apt to think, that any rational creature can be more than innocent ; for to be innocent, is to be no transgressor of any Law (*i.e.*) of any Law which commands good, or forbids evil ; and how any one can rationally be conceived to be more innocent, than to be no transgressor of any such Law, I do not know, except there be works of supererrogation.

3. It is the Doctor's gross mistake to think, that *Adam's* obedience to the divine command,

(Do

(Do this) was by God constituted the condition of his having a right, or title to life (for that right he had already, by vertue of that habitual innocency or holiness, in which he was created) whereas it was the condition only of his holding that right to life, which at present he had. And if *Adam* could not have had a title to life, before he had kept all the Commandments, he could not have had right so long as he liv'd (I mean) not till his last gasp.

4. The Doctor very absurdly supposeth things contradictory in supposing, That *Adam* was, or could be innocent any longer, than he did continue to keep Gods Commandments: For he, who doth only forbear the evil, which God forbids, but doth not do the good enjoyned, is neither truly, nor reputatively innocent.

5. It is falsly said by the Doctor, That the resolution of the said enquiry, is found in the Righteousness of the life of Christ, which he lived upon earth, this being evidently his meaning, for which he quotes two Scriptures, but abuses both of them.

For 1. By that life of Christ, by which the Apostle says, we shall be saved, *Rom. 5. 10.* is not meant the life of Christ, which in the state of his humiliation he lived upon earth, but the life of glory, which he (never to die again) doth now live, in his estate of exaltation and session at the right hand of God, of which his life the Apostle speaks in *Heb. 7. 25.* *He ever liveth to make intercession for us.*

2. As for that other Text alledged by him, *Phil. 3. 9.* he hath often abused it, as often as in any place of his Book he hath handled it: For by the Righteousness there said to be of God by faith,
is

is not meant Christs personal Righteousness (the Righteousness of Christs life imputed to Believers) but that Righteousness , which doth consist in the faith of Christ, or in being faithful Christians.

C H A P. X X X I I.

That it is no where said in Scripture, that we do receive the Righteousness of Christ. The Doctor's perverting that in Phil. 3. 9. from the true meaning of the Apostle. That he perverts the sence of 1 Cor. 1. 30. utterly beside the meaning of the Apostle. That he mistakes the sence of Rom. 5. 10. That Christ hath done no more by the obedience of his life for a sinners salvation, than for his reconciliation, the contrary whereunto is supposed by Dr. O. His iterated mistake touching the end of Adam's obedience.

TH E Doctor saith, p. 186. *The Righteousness we receive, is opposed to our own obedience to the Law; opposed to it, not as something in another kind, but as something in the same kind, excluding that from such an end, which the other obtains. Now this is that obedience of Christ to the Law; himself thereby being made to us Righteousness, 1 Cor. 1. 30.*

Ans. 1. By the Righteousness we receive, it is evident, that the Doctor means Christs obedience
to

to the Law, performed in his life-time; whereupon I answer, That it is neither said in that Scripture, neither is there such a saying in any other Scripture, That Believers do receive the Righteousness of Christ, or his obedience to the Law; although it be true, that they do in a passive sense of the word receive it (*i. e.*) they by means of their believing, do enjoy the righteousness or obedience of Christ, in the saving fruits and effects thereof.

2. The Doctor doth err grossly in thinking, That by the righteousness of the Law, the Apostle means his own *evangelical* righteousness, or obedience to the Gospel-Law, and that this is it, which he opposes to Christs personal righteousness, or to Christs obedience to the Law: For it is plain both by the Text it self, and Context, That by the Law he means the Jewish Law, and that by his own righteousness, he means that which was his own, when a Jew (not that which was his own, when a Convert to the Christian faith) and that the things there opposed are Judaism and Christianity, or Judaical observances, and the practical knowledge of Christ. So that our own *evangelical* righteousness, is neither in the same kind, nor in any other kind, there opposed to the obedience of Christ; nor is it either in that Scripture, or in any other, excluded from such an end, which Christs Righteousness doth obtain, I mean, the salvation of a sinner: For in order to this end, our *evangelical* righteousness stands not in any opposition, but in a due subordination to Christs. As Christs Righteousness doth, after a manner peculiar to it self, so doth our own righteousness, in its manner, tend to our obtaining that, which St. Peter styles, *The end of our faith, even the salvation of our souls.*

Whence

Whence that command of the Apostle, *So run, that ye may obtain*, 1 Cor. 9. 24. It is by running, that (through, by, or under Christ) we do obtain.

3. The Doctor perverts the sense of 1 Cor. 1. 30. that Scripture in no sort proving the thing, for the proof whereof it is alledged by him : For the Apostle doth not there say (as he would have him) That Christ is made Righteousness unto us by Gods reckoning, or imputing Christs perfect and compleat obedience of the Law unto us, this being the thing undertaken by him to be proved by that Scripture ; which as that Scripture doth not prove, (for it proves only, that Christ was of God made Righteousness unto us) so another place of Scripture (2 Cor. 5. 21.) doth most convincingly disprove it ; it being there asserted, that we are made in Christ the Righteousness of God (*i. e.*) very righteous by God (the abstract being put for the concrete, as is very usual in the language of Scripture, and particularly so used, *Esa. 60. 17.* where God promiseth to his Church, that he will make all their Exactors Righteousness (*i. e.*) very just, honest, or righteous) it being, I say, there asserted, that we are of God made in Christ most righteous, by means of his being made sin (*i. e.*) a sin-offering for us, not by Gods reckoning to us Christs perfect and compleat obedience to the Law.

In the same Page again he abuses that Text in *Rom. 5. 10.* saying, *The issue of the death of Christ is placed upon reconciliation, that is a slaying of the enmity, and restoring us into that condition of peace and friendship, wherein Adam was before his fall. But is there no more to be done ? Notwithstanding that there was no wrath due to Adam, yet he was to obey,*

obey, if he would enjoy eternal life: Something moreover there is to be done in respect of us, if after the slaying of the enmity and reconciliation made, we shall enjoy life; being reconciled by his death, we are saved by that perfect obedience, which in his life he yielded to the Law of God.

Ans. 1. I have already vindicated that Scripture, from the same abuse put upon it by the Doctor, having manifested, that by the life of Christ, is there meant the life which he now lives in glory, interceding for us at the right hand of God, not the life which he lived on earth.

2. Had the Apostle meant the life, which Christ lived on earth, it will not thence follow, that his meaning was, that we are saved, by Gods reckoning to us the perfect and compleat obedience of that his life (*i. e.*) imputing his obedience it self unto us.

3. Though being reconciled to God, there is somewhat to be done by us (*i. e.*) in order to the continuing of our friendship with God--nevertheless there needs no more to a sinners salvation at present, than his present reconciliation, nor doth there need more to his future and final salvation, than the continuance of his reconciliation and friendship with God: For if being reconciled to God, he and we do continue friends, we shall as certainly be saved, as it is certain, that Christ at the right hand of God, ever liveth to make intercession for us.

4. It is falsely insinuated by the Doctor, That Christ hath done more, or that it is needful, that he should do more for our salvation, than for our reconciliation, I mean, for the beginning, continuing, or perfecting of the one, than of the other, salvation from the guilt of sin, whether it be initial,

tial, progressive, or consummate, being in effect the same benefit with Reconciliation with God, in its being begun, continued, and made perfect in the fruit thereof.

5. If there was no wrath due to *Adam*, nothing could ever have obstructed his entrance into life, the contrary whereunto is presumed by the Doctor.

6. As it was once already said, so I say again, That *Adam* was to obey, not that he might enjoy a right to eternal life, which he had not antecedently to that his actual obedience, but that his title thereunto might be continued, and he thereupon might be brought at last to the full enjoyment thereof.

The Doctor proceeds in the same Page, to abuse the Scriptures by whole clusters, which I will endeavour to manifest in the next Chapter.

C H A P. XXXIII.

The Doctor's allegation of several Scriptures, to no purpose. That we are no otherwise justified, than we are reconciled, or pardoned through the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, the contrary whereunto is pretended by Dr. O. That none of those Scriptures alledged by him, to prove the Imputation of Christs obedience it self unto us, do evince the same. His error in attributing our justification to the Life of Christ, whereas the Apostle doth (Rom. 5. 9.) expressly attribute it to his Death, however it is not to be understood, as excluding the obedience of his Life.

HE saith, p. 186. There is distinct mention made of Reconciliation, through a non-imputation of sin, as Psal. 32. 1. Luk. 1. 77. Rom. 3. 25. 2 Cor. 5. 19. and justification, through an Imputation of righteousness, Jer. 23. 6. Rom. 4. 5. 1 Cor. 1. 30. although these things are so far from being separated, that they are reciprocally affirmed of one another, which as it doth not evince an identity, so it doth an eminent conjunction. And this last we have by the life of Christ.

Ansiv.

1. There is no mention at all so much as of the word Reconciliation, in three of the four recited Scriptures, viz. Psal. 32. 1. Luk. 1. 77. Rom. 3. 25.
And

And by perusing the places the Reader may know, whether he should believe the Doctor, or his own eyes.

2. Much less is there mention of Reconciliation, through a non-imputation of sin, as distinct from justification, in any of those three Texts of Scripture.

3. Though there be mention of Reconciliation, and a non-imputation of sin, in one of the fore-cited Scriptures, 2 Cor. 5. 19. yet neither is the one, or the other there mentioned, as distinct from justification, through an Imputation of Christs Righteousness, as the Doctor says.

4. We are no otherwise justified, than we are pardoned, or reconciled to God, through the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, Christs Righteousness it self being no more necessary, nor acting any otherwise for the effecting of the one, than of the other, the agency thereof being that of a morally efficient, or meritorious cause, towards our remission, reconciliation, and justification.

5. If by the Doctor's confession, reconciliation and justification are reciprocally affirmed one of another, I am apt to think, that Philosophy will warrant us from thence to conclude an identity. And by the last fore-cited Scripture, the identity, which the Doctor denies, may undoubtedly be evinced: For the non-imputation of sin, together with our reconciliation with God, is there mentioned as all one, even the self same thing, with our being made the Righteousness of God in Christ, which may be truly paraphrased, with our being justified by the Righteousness of Christ; but is falsely glossed, as the Doctor would have it, with the Imputation of the perfect and compleat righteousness,

ousness, or obedience of Christ to the Law of God.

As for the other three places of Scripture alledged by him, he doth manifestly wrest them: For

1. Though it be said in *Jer. 23. 6.* That *this is his name, whereby he shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness* (let who will be there meant by the Lord, whether God the Father, as Mr. *John Humfreys* thinks, or God the Son, as many others, it matters not here to make enquiry) yet there is no such thing there either mentioned, or meant, as Justification, through an Imputation of Christs Righteousness unto us.

2. Although in *Rom. 4. 5.* there is mention made of Gods Imputing Righteousness unto us, yet by Righteousness is not there meant the Righteousness of Christ (*i. e.*) his perfect and compleat obedience to the Law, nor are we by that expression of the Apostle given to understand, that the said righteousness, or obedience of Christ is imputed to us, but by it is meant a certain righteousness, which is the effect and fruit of Christs Righteousness, and which for the sake of Christs Righteousness, is imputed to us, or confer'd upon us.

3. There is not the least sound, or whisper, of a sinners justification, through the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, in *1 Cor. 1. 30.* although the Doctor hath endeavoured several times, to pervert that Text to such a sence, as was never intended by the Apostle.

4. Whereas he says (as he hath said often) that this last (*i. e.*) justification, through an Imputation of Christs Righteousness, we have by the life of Christ, he doth expressly contradict the Apostle,

Apostle, who affirms, That we are justified by the Blood of Christ (*i. e.*) by his bloody death.

The Doctor proceeds in his perverting the true sence of certain other Scriptures, as after the recital of his words, I will demonstrate in the following Chapter.

CHAP. XXXIV.

Doctor Owen's mis-interpretation of Zech. 3.3,4. That remission of sin is no more the proper fruit of Christs death (as the Doctor would have it) than is Justification. That there is not required a collation of Righteousness, over and above remission of sin (as he asserts) in order to a right to heaven. His allegation of Esa.61,10. to no purpose.

P.187. **T**HIS (that is, the distinct mention of Reconciliation, through a non-imputation of sin, and Justification, through an Imputation of righteousness) is fully expressed, in that Typical representation of our justification before the Lord, Zech.3.3,4,5. Two things are there expressed, to belong to our free Acceptation before God, 1. The taking away the guilt of our sin, our filthy robes: This is done by the death of Christ, remission of sin is the proper fruit thereof; but there is more also required, even a Collation of righteousness, and thereby a right to life eternal; this is here called fine change of rayment: So the Holy Ghost expresseth it again, Esa. 61.10. where he calls it plainly the garment of salvation, and the robe of righteousness: Now this is only made ours by the obedience of Christ, as the other by his death.

Answ.

We are now come to Visions and Revelations of the Lord, in the Expositions whercof, I do confess

feels my self to have little exercised my talent ; nevertheless I reply :

1. In a flat gainfaying his interpretation, and denial, that this (*i. e.*) that reconciliation with God, and justification, through the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, as things distinct, is fully expressed, in that Typical representation of the matter in *Zeck. 3*. For although I do yield, that remission of sins is represented by that visible sign, (*I have caused thine iniquities (i. e.) in the guilt and punishment of them, to pass from thee (i. e.) I have pardoned them*) nevertheless I deny, that by the fine change of rayment, is there meant the Righteousness of Christ, or justification, through the Imputation of it unto us ; but I rather think, that by it is meant our own personal righteousness, or holiness, which doth oft-times in Scripture, go under the Metaphorical expression of a splendid vest, fine linnen, robe, or the like, as I have already manifested.

Briefly, My opinion is, That in the said vision of the Prophet, there is a representation of justification (or remission of sin) and sanctification, as distinct things, but not (as the Doctor will have it expounded) of reconciliation (or remission) and of justification, through the Imputation of Christs Righteousness.

2. Remission of sin is no more the proper fruit of Christs death (as the Doctor says) than is our justification ; for as the Apostle somewhere says, (*We have redemption through his Blood, even the Forgiveness of our sins*) so he doth elsewhere say, *We are justified by his Blood*, *Rom. 5. 9*. I doubt not to say, It is a great mistake in this Doctor (as in many others) to assign our Reconciliation, or remission of sin, and our Justification, to several distinct

distinct causes, the former to Christs passive obedience (his death) the other to his active (the obedience of his life imputed) whereas the truth is in these two things ;

1. That reconciliation, or remission of sin, and justification, are the self same thing in effect, as was aforesaid.

2. Being the same thing in effect, although they are expressed by divers names, yet they are wholly to be ascribed to the whole obedience of Christ (both of his life and death) as joyntly constituting the meritorious cause thereof ; so that neither is remission of sin, to be more said to be the proper fruit of Christs death, than justification, nor justification, more properly the fruit of Christs life, than remission of sin.

3. I deny what the Doctor here affirms, viz. That over and above remission of sin, there is required a collation of righteousness, in order to a right to heaven. This hath been at large already disproved in *Cb.23*.

4. Whether the Doctor doth here assert Christs Righteousness it self, or a right to eternal life thereby confer'd, to be the fine linnen spoken of in *Zech.3*. is questionable : For it is doubtful, what construction he would have his Readers to make of the Relative *This*, (he saying, This is here called fine change of rayment) I mean, whether he would have it understood concerning the Righteousness of Christ, or concerning the right to life eternal by it. This latter construction is of the two more obvious and rational, because right to eternal life, is in the order of his words the nearest Antecedent, the other (a collation of righteousness) being a little more remote. But let him be understood of either, as I said before, so I say again,

again, That by the fine change of rayment, neither of these are to be understood, but the righteousness of sanctification, or fine vestment of holiness.

5. In the Exposition of *Esay 61.10.* I perceive a great difference betwixt the Doctor, and very many of the Brethren of his mind in this controverſie : For they undertaking to shew the meaning of the Holy Ghost therein, do confidently say, That the Holy Ghost, by the robe of righteousness, and garment of salvation there mentioned, doth mean, The Righteousness of Christ himself ; and thence it is, that they do rhetorically set forth the properties thereof, under the notion of a Vest, how that it is Fine, Pure, White, Rich, Splendid—But the Doctor tells us, That the Holy Ghost says not so ; for that, which the Holy Ghost doth there mean by the garment of salvation, is not the Righteousness of Christ, but a right to eternal life collated upon us, by the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us. Upon this occasion, I call to mind what is charged upon the false Prophets of old, *Ezek. 13. 7. They said, the Lord saith it, albeit the Lord never spake it.* In like sort may it be said, concerning the Authors of both the said Interpretations, They say, The Holy Ghost means this and that by the garment of salvation, and the Robe of Righteousness, whereas the truth is, the Holy Ghost in the Prophets words, did mean neither this, nor that, but some other thing (as I have already demonstrated in *Chap. 30.*)

6. Whereas the Doctor concludes, saying (This is only made ours by the obedience of Christ) and whereas his meaning therein is, that the other, *viz.* Remission of sin, or reconciliation, is made
ours

ours by the death of Christ, I shall still deny it *Toties Quoties*, even as oft as the Doctor shall affirm it.

The Doctor proceeds to answer an Objection, which in his sagacity, he fore-saw would be made against the doctrine by him maintained, touching the Imputation of Christs perfect obedience to the Law (even it it self) unto us, *viz.* That it will follow from thence, that we are as righteous as is Christ himself. But this Objection, together with the Doctor's unsatisfactory Answer thereunto, I have already mentioned, and made a reply to upon a fit occasion, in *Chap. 25.* to which I shall refer the Reader.

There is only a passage or two more in *p. 193.* (wherein the Doctor speaks to the same purpose as before) which I will recite, and make reply unto.

C H A P. X X X V.

That our deliverance from a state of rejection, or un-acceptation, and our Acceptation with God, are not two things; and to be ascribed to two several causes, as the Doctor pretends. That in 2 Cor. 5. 21. mis-alleged by him for his purpose, re-torted to the purpose against him. His unreasonableness in supposing, the old quarrel betwixt God and us to be taken away, and yet no new friendship contracted. His senseless contradiction in supposing, That Adam was guilty of no sin, and yet not to have had thereupon a positive as well as a negative holiness. That the non-imputation of sin, and the Imputation of righteousness, are not two things, but one and the same thing. That Christs Righteousness is not our righteousness before God, otherwise than in a causal sence, and that our righteousness it self before God is our own personal righteousness. That in Rom. 5. 18. vainly alleged by the Doctor, to prove his purpose. That the non imputation of sin, and the Imputation of righteousness (as they are the same thing) so they are to be ascribed to one and the same cause.

P. 193. **B***Y his death Christ bearing the curse; undergoing the punishment, that was due*

due to us, paying the ransom, that was due for us, delivers us from this condition (that is, a state of rejection, and our un-acceptation) and thus far the death of Christ is the cause of our Acceptation with God, that all cause of quarrel and rejection of us is thereby taken away; and to that end are his sufferings reckoned to us: For being made sin for us, 2 Cor. 5. 21. he is made righteousness unto us, 1 Cor. 1. 30.

Ans.

1. The Doctor doth most unreasonably make a sinners deliverance, from a state of rejection or un-acceptation, and his Acceptation with God, to be two things, whereas they are indeed but one and the same thing, and done at the same time, by one and the same divine act: For as the Physician doth not remove the disease by one act, and restore health to the Patient by another act (healing the disease, and restoring health, being but two different names, or considerations of one and the same thing) in like manner God doth not deliver from a state of un-acceptation by one act, and restore us to a state of Acceptation by another, these two being but two different names, expressions, notions, or considerations of the same thing.

2: As our deliverance from a state of un-acceptation, and our Acceptation with God, are the self same thing, and done by one and the same act of God, so they are to be ascribed to the self same cause, and not unto different causes, as the Doctor would have them to be assigned, to wit, the former precisely to the death of Christ, or the Imputation of Christs sufferings to us, the latter to the life of Christ, or Imputation of the obedience of his life to us, neither of which indeed (whether

ther his doings, or sufferings) are properly, and in themselves reckoned to us, but only in the effects thereof, as hath oft upon occasion been before said.

3. The whole of our reconciliation to God, (our deliverance from enmity, and restoration into divine favour, or friendship, if any one list to divide it into those two parts) our Acceptation with God, or Justification before God, is ascribed to the death of Christ, as hath been already proved from *Rom. 5. 9.* the same being also proveable from *Col. 1. 20.*

4. As one of those Scriptures alledged by the Doctor (*1 Cor. 1. 30.*) makes nothing for him, so the other (*2 Cor. 5. 21.*) makes point blank, and most fully against him, as hath been already demonstrated.

The Doctor goes on, saying, in the same Page, and in the words immediately following;

But yet farther, This (that is, the removal of our guilt, or deliverance from a state of rejection, or unacceptation) will not compleat our Acceptation with God. The old quarrel may be laid aside, and yet no new friendship begun. We may be not sinners, and yet not be so far righteous, as to have a right to the kingdom of heaven. Adam had no right to life, because he was innocent, he must moreover do This, and then he shall live. He must not only have a negative righteousness, he was not guilty of any thing, but also a positive righteousness, he must do all things. This then is required in the second place, to our Compleat Acceptation, that we have not only the non-imputation of sin, but also a reckoning of righteousness. Now this we have in the obedience of the life of Christ. This also was discovered in the last Chapter.

ser. The obedience of the life of Christ was for us, is imputed to us, and is our Righteousness before God : By his obedience are we made righteous, Rom. 5. 18.

Answ.

All this in effect hath been already answered, the repetition whereof being needless, I add, that,

1. It is here contrary to sense and reason, supposed by the Doctor, that the old quarrel betwixt God and us may be taken away, and yet no new friendship begun : For it is alike as to suppose darkness to be expel'd, and yet no new light to be introduced, or sickness removed, and no health brought in place. And as for the word (Reconciliation) I have always hitherunto understood the meaning of the word (passively taken) that it is To be made friends ; and I cannot reconcile it to sense or reason, to make any other construction of it, as if persons could be Reconciled, and yet not made Friends.

2. It is a senseless contradiction for the Doctor to imagine (as he doth) that *Adam* was not guilty of any thing, and yet that he had not a positive as well as a negative righteousness : For to imagine, or suppose this, is to suppose him to be guilty of no sin at all, and yet to suppose him guilty of some sin (*i. e.*) of sin, or sins of omission.

3. Suppose that *Adam* must have a positive as well as a negative righteousness, in order to his right to life, yet it will not follow from thence, That in order to our right to life, we must have the positive righteousness, or perfect obedience of Christ's life, in it self imputed to us for that end,
the

the Imputation of Christs positive Righteousness unto us for that purpose, being no more necessary, than the Imputation of his negative Righteousness.

4. A non-imputation of sin, and a reckoning of righteousness, are the self same thing in effect, as appears evidently by *Rom. 4. 5, 6.* and so likewise is reconciliation, or a non-imputation of sin, all one with righteousness, or our being made the righteousness of God in Christ, as appears by *2 Cor. 5. 19, 21.* That act of God, whereby he doth perfectly pardon our sin, is interpretatively nothing else, but an Imputation of a perfect righteousness, or a fulfilling of the Law, even as that act, by which the Sun dispels the darkness, doth fill the air with light.

5. The obedience of Christ verily was for us, but it may not therefore be truly said in it self to be imputed to us, nor is it our righteousness before God otherwise, than in a causal sense.

6. Nor doth that Text here alledged by the Doctor (*Rom. 5. 18.*) prove in the least, that the obedience of Christs life is imputed to us, it having been oft times for this purpose alledged by him, but still I must say, to no purpose.

7. The Imputation of righteousness (which is indeed all one with the non-imputation of sin) we have from the joynt obedience of Christs life and death, but not from both of them, or from either of them, in themselves imputed to us.

C H A P. X X X V I.

The difference betwixt Dr. Owen and Mr. Ferguson in their opinion, concerning the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, or Obedience unto us, plainly laid open in their own words, recited. That the Doctor denies Christs death to have been in our stead, but only as it was penal. The Author's opinion plainly and expressly declared, in opposition to the Doctor's. That satisfaction was no otherwise the effect of Christs death as a penalty, than as a price, and as a sacrifice.

I Shall close what I have to say, concerning the Imputation of Christs Righteousness unto us, by acquainting the Reader, that the fore-named Authors (Dr. O. and Mr. F.) do to my seeming, so plainly differ betwixt themselves, touching that Righteousness of Christ, by them asserted to be imputed to us, that I am not able to reconcile them, Mr. F. asserting the Imputation of all Christs Mediatory Obedience unto us, but the Doctor only one part thereof: And that what seems thus to me, may appear to others, I will more at large recite the words of them both, and thereupon leave the judgment thereof, to every indifferent and intelligent Reader.

God (says Mr. F. p.558,559.) having admitted the interposure of Christ on our behalf, and having inflicted sufferings upon him, as a punishment for

for our sins, and having accepted those sufferings, as a sacrifice of atonement for the expiation of our guilt, and having also agreed with his Son, and declared in the Covenant of grace the terms, on which we are made partakers of the benefits thereof, we upon the performance of these conditions, come to have all that Christ did and suffered as our Mediator, Imputed to us in a Law-sence. And this being all, that we do intend by a Legal Union with Christ, namely, That by the Covenant of redemption, Christ so becomes our Surrogate, as to have our sins in a Law-sence imputed to him, and we through fulfilling the terms of the Covenant of grace, have all that Christ did and suffered as our Mediator, Imputed in a Law-sence to us: He must not only disclaim Christs being Mediator in any proper sence, but renounce the whole Gospel, that denies it.

Thus we perceive plainly, that Mr. F. is for the Imputation of all Christs Mediatory obedience unto us (as of our sins to him) in a Law-sence, that is, and as that phrase is usually explained, in such sort, as if we had done all that he did, and suffered all that he suffered, or as if God did repute, that we in and by Christ had done and suffered the whole thereof: Thus Mr. Rol's in his *Prodromus* explains the sence, saying (p.86.) *God reckons Believers in and by Christ their Surety, to have satisfied divine justice.* And we perceive also by the words fore-cited, what a dreadful sentence Mr. F. passes upon all those, who gainsay the said Imputation of all Christs Mediatory obedience; which (for ought I can perceive) will light heavily upon Dr. O. himself, as well as any others: For the Doctor doth distinguish concerning a double Law, to which Christ as our Mediator did perform obedience;

1. General (i. e.) the Law of nature, or moral Law, comprizing every Law of God, whereto we were subject and obnoxious.

2. Special, or the peculiar Law of Mediatorship, which respected himself meerly; and to this peculiar Law he refers Christs obedience in dying, *Job. 10. 18.* Thus he doth distinguish in his Book, (*Comm. p. 178, 179.*) Now what obedience of Christ is imputed to us, or to which of those Laws [to one, or both] as he doth there determine, so he doth fully explain in his late Vindication, p. 213, 214. whose words I shall transcribe, as followeth;

Plainly (says he) *I have shewed, that there was an especial Law of Mediatorship, which Christ was subject unto, as the commandment of the Father, That he should be incarnate, that he should be the King, Priest and Prophet of his Church, that he should bear our iniquities, make his soul an offering for sin, and give his life a ransom for many, were the principal parts of this Law. The whole of it I have lately explain'd, in my Exercitations unto the second part of the Exposition, on the Epistle to the Hebrews. This Law our Lord Jesus Christ did not yield obedience to in our stead, as if we had been obliged originally unto the duties of it, which we neither were, nor could be; although what he suffered penally in any of them, was in our stead, without which consideration he could not have righteously suffered in any kind. And the following trivial exception of this Author, about the obligation on us to lay down our lives for the Brethren, is meet for him to put in; seeing we are not obliged so to die for any one, as Christ died for us. Was Paul crucified for you?*

But

But secondly, *Christ our Mediator, and as Mediator, was obliged unto all that obedience unto the moral Law, and all other Laws of God, that the Church was obliged unto; and that, which I have asserted hereon is, That the effects of the former obedience of Christ are communicated unto us, but the latter obedience it self is imputed unto us.* And as for the former obedience, his express words are, (*Comm. p.181.*)

It is not Imputed unto us, as though we had done it, though the ἀποτάγματα and fruits of it are.

Thus by comparing the words of the said Authors together, we may palpably perceive the difference betwixt them, reconcile them, who can for me; for I cannot; so that, how the Doctor can avoid coming under the said terrible censure, or sentence of his Brother Mr. F. I know not. But the comfort truly is, That as the curse causeless shall not come, and is not therefore to be dreaded, so Mr. *Ferguson's* sentence being groundless, need not therefore to be feared, whether by the Doctor, or by any other: For he, who denies the Imputation of our sin to Christ, and of all he did and suffered (all his active, and all his passive obedience) to us, in Mr. *Ferguson's* Law-sence, doth not disclaim Christ his being our Mediator, in any proper sence, nor doth he renounce any part, or tittle of the Gospel, as hath been already manifested in this Treatise; nor doth the said denial impeach any such Union of Believers with Christ, which the Scriptures do assert, by what name soever it be entituled, whether Legal, or Moral, or any other name of mans impoling: Nor doth it properly belong to the office of Medi-

ation, or to a proper Mediator, that what is done by him in person, should be in it self (properly and formally considered) imputed unto, or reckoned as done by the person, in whose behalf he doth mediate. Yet if instead of the word Mediator, Mr. F. had used the word Surety, I would have yielded, That Christ is not in any place of Scripture said to be our Surety, in a strict and proper sence of the word : For so far as hitherto I have apprehended the sence of the word, in the propriety thereof, a proper Surety is bound to the Creditor in the self same Bond or obligation, with the principal Debtor : Now the case betwixt Christ and us is otherwise ; for he is not bound in the same Bond with us, nor was our obligation translated upon him, or assumed by him, but he took upon him an obligation peculiar to himself, which obligation was not only individually, but also specifically different from ours, ours being *Obligatio Criminis*, and his only *Contractus*, as hath been before said, and prov'd. Moreover, Christ is not our Surety in any more proper sence, than our sins are proper debts, or God a proper Creditor, which expressions are not proper, but Metaphorical. And withal I will say, That although I should deny, that Christ is in any place of Scripture said to be our Surety in a proper sence, yet it will not from thence follow, that I do deny the whole Gospel, or any the least scruple of the Gospel.

I shall now return to the words of Dr. O. forecited, whereupon I desire it may be observed ;

1. That having asserted Christs dying for our sins, to be a principal part of the Law of Mediation

on peculiar to himself, he doth both affirm and deny his obedience thereunto to have been in our stead.

1. He doth simply deny, that his obedience thereunto, or dying for us, was in our stead.

2. He doth affirm it in some respect to have been in our stead, *viz.* as his death was penal, and so likewise that all which he suffered penally, in what pertained to the peculiar Law of the Mediator, was in our stead; and this he affirms for this reason, *viz.* because otherwise he could not have righteously suffered in any kind.

To which I reply;

1. To the reason of his affirmation, and that by denying the force of it, and by asserting the contrary, *viz.* That although Christs death as penal, had not been in our stead (*i. e.*) imputed to us, in the Law-fence as aforesaid, as if we had suffered in and by him what he suffered (which is the Doctor's meaning of the word [*instead*] nevertheless he might righteously suffer, and he did righteously suffer in that kind, and in many other kinds besides death it self: For he did no less spontaneously, than at the will of his Father, take upon him an obligation so to do (*i. e.*) to be obedient, even unto death, for the expiation of our sins; whereupon the Doctor may remember the old and true saying, *Volenti non fit injuria.*

2. As to what was both affirmed and denied by the Doctor, I reply;

1. What he denies simply, I shall simply affirm, That Christs death was in our stead, yea in all manner of considerations of it, it was in our stead.

2. What he affirms concerning the death of Christ in one respect, or under one consideration of his death, I shall deny under consideration of the sence of the phrase [instead] as by him intended, saying, Christ did not either in that, or any other consideration of his death, die in our stead, (*i.e.*) strictly, and in a Law-sence, *In personâ nostrâ*, as if so be God had reckoned his death to be our death, or that we had suffered death in and by him, or as if our obligation to suffer punishment, had been transfer'd upon him.

3. Forasmuch as the Doctor doth simply deny, that, which for my own part I never did, but do simply and positively affirm the contrary, *viz.* That the death of Christ was in our *stead*, I may well think it strange, that he hath hitherto escaped the charge of Socinianism; whereas if my self, or any of my Brethren, who maintain what I have professedly asserted in this controversie, should simply deny, That Christs death was in our stead, I am much afraid, that we should not so escape, but that rather our names would be enrolled in that black List. But that it may farther appear, what a great gulf there is fixed betwixt us and the Socinians, I do here profess in my own (and I do not know, but that I may sincerely make the same profession, in the name of all those my Brethren) saying,

After all this Dispute, I do freely and plainly confess and acknowledg, and this I do without any of Dr. *Owen's* distinctions, That All Christs Mediatory Obedience, To Any Law Whatsoever, [Common To Us, Or Peculiar To Himself] Especially His Obedience To The Death Of The Cross, Was Under All Considerations [Both As A Penalty,

nalty, As A Price, And As A Sacrifice] In Our Stead ; And Forasmuch As The Dignity, Or Value Of All His Obedience, Did Depend Upon The Dignity Of His Person (He Being Both God, And Man) I Do Confess, That All His Obedience Was In Our Stead (That is) To Bestead Us ; And That It Did Bestead Us, In The Purchasing Of A Pardon, And Life Eternal For Us, Upon Terms Expressed In The Gospel, Promised To Us, And Upon Performance Thereof, To Be Confer'd Upon Us ; And That The Said Obedience Of Christ (Both Active, and Passive, As It Is Usually Stiled) Is Imputed To Us, Although Not Immediately, And In It Self, Yet To As Much Purpose, And Real Benefit, As If It Were Actually, Or Could Possibly Be So Imputed, (that is) That It Is Imputed To Us In All Its Saving Fruits, And Blessed Effects, All That His Foresaid Obedience, Making Up One Entire Meritorious Cause Of All The Said Benefits, And Blessings.

Hereupon as God makes his appeal, saying, (*And now O Inhabitants of Jerusalem, and men of Judah, judge I pray you between me and my vineyard, what could have been done more, than—*) in like sort shall I make my appeal to all, saying, And now (Men, Brethren and Fathers) judge I pray you betwixt us, who do make the said Confession of our faith in this matter, and our adversaries, who notwithstanding will clamour against us, and stigmatize us with that odious name of Socinianism ; what need we ? what can we [*salva veritate*] say more, whereby to acquit our selves from all cause, or colour of being accused as Socinians.

Lastly, I reply upon occasion of the Doctor's fore-cited words, That forasmuch as he doth acknowledge Christs death to have been in our stead, only as it was penal, or a punishment, it is therefore justly enquirable, under what consideration, or in what respect his death was not in our stead; and by observing what he says concerning the death of Christ (*p.188. Comm.*) it seems to me, That he denies it to be in our stead, as it was a Price, and as it was a Sacrifice; and that this may appear to others as well as to my self, I will recite his words, as followeth;

The death of Christ is in Scripture proposed under a three-fold consideration, Of a Price, of a Sacrifice, and of a Penalty.

1. *It is a Price*, 1 Cor. 6. 20. 1 Pet. 1. 19. 1 Tim. 4. 6. *Now the proper effect and issue of the death of Christ as a price, or ransom, is Redemption* —

2. *P.189. It was a Sacrifice also*, Heb. 10. 5. Eps. 5. 2. *Now the end of Sacrifices, such as his was, bloody, and for sin*, Rom. 4. 3. Heb. 2. 17. *was Atonement and Reconciliation*, Eph. 5. 2. Eps. 5. 2. Dan. 9. 24. Rom. 5. 10 —

3. *It was also a Punishment, a punishment in our stead*, Eps. 5. 2. 6. 12. 1 Pet. 2. 24 — *Now bearing of punishment tends directly, to the giving satisfaction to him, who was offended, and on that account inflicted the punishment* — *His substituting himself in our room, being allowed of by the Righteous Judge, satisfaction to him doth thence properly ensue.*

To this I reply, saying,

1. Redemption and Reconciliation are not at all distinct benefits of the death of Christ; for they are

are one and the self same saving benefit, they being but distinct or several names, given in several respects to one and the same thing: And the very truth is, That Redemption (*i. e.*) redemption from the guilt of sin (I mean the word Redemption passively taken) and Reconciliation with God, even as also forgiveness of sin, and justification, with many other words which might be named, are Synonymous expressions in Scripture, importing in effect the self same thing, as may appear by the current of the Scriptures, many whereof have been already named, to which, more, were it needful, may easily be added, 2 Cor. 5. 18, 19. Eph. 1. 7. Col. 1. 14. Rom. 5. 9, 10. and 4. 24, 25. Gal. 3. 13, 14. with v. 8.

2. As Redemption and Reconciliation are one and the same saving benefit of Christs death, so much less do they flow from any such nice, or distinct consideration, as the Doctor affirms (*i. e.*) the one from the consideration of Christs death, as a Price, and the other as a Sacrifice: But as they are in effect one saving benefit, so they flow from one cause, the death of Christ, our reconciliation flowing no more, or otherwise from the death of Christ as a Sacrifice, than as a Price; nor doth our redemption more flow from the death of Christ as a Price (however it may be thence denominated) than from it as a Sacrifice, but entirely from the death of Christ, as a meritorious cause, it being all one in effect to say, it follows from it as an expiatory Sacrifice, as to say, it follows from it as a valuable Price.

3. I know no more reason to say, That satisfaction is the issue of Christs death, considered as a Penalty, than as it was a Price, or Sacrifice;
for

for Christs death was as well a Price satisfactory, and a Sacrifice satisfactory, as a Punishment satisfactory : For the end of paying a Price, and the end of Sacrifices, was satisfaction of its kind, and to say, that Christs death was a Propitiatory, or Expiatory Sacrifice, is all one (I ever thought) as to say, it is a Satisfactory Sacrifice. So that I am altogether dissatisfied, as to the fountain, or rise of the Satisfaction here mentioned by the Doctor, God being as well satisfied by the death of Christ, under the notion of a Price, or Sacrifice, as of a Penalty.

4. In what sence the death of Christ was, or may be said to be a Punishment, I have already declared in answer to Mr. F. and it will not be needful here, to repeat what hath been there said.

5. Finally, Whereas the Doctor doth only affirm, That Christs death was in our stead, under the consideration of a Penalty, I have already in the third Branch of my Reply, shewed, That it was under all considerations in our stead (both as a Penalty, as a Price, and as a Sacrifice) and I have explained moreover, in what sence it was in our stead; and I desire the Reader, that he would again peruse it, as if it had been in this place [together with my said Appeal] again inserted.

I will conclude with that Prayer of Calvin, which Beza his Scholar tells us was his constant form, before his Lectures in the publick Schools ; *Dei nobis Dominus in Cælestis sue sapientiæ mysteriis cum vere pietatis profectu versari, in gloriam suam, & ædificationem nostram. Amen.*

Beaks

Printed by Walter Kettilby, at the Bishops Head in St. Paul's Church-Yard.



*Books Printed for, and Sold
by Walter Kettilby, at
the Bishops Head in St.
Paul's Church-Yard.*

H. *Mori Opera Theologica*, Folio. Price
1 l. 10 s.

Dr. *More's* Reply to a late Answer to his
Antidote against Idolatry, with the Appen-
dix, Octavo. Price 4 s.

Spencer dissertatio de Urim & Thummim,
Octavo. Price 3 s. 6 d.

Frederici Lossi Observationes Medici,
Octavo. Price 2 s. 6 d.

*Epigrammata Juvenilia in quatuor partes
divisa, Encomia, Seria, Satyras & Jocosas*, per
Gulielmum Speed. Price bound 9 d.

Dr. *Smyth's* unjust mans doom: as exa-
mined by the several kinds of Justice, and
their obligation with a particular represen-
tation of Injustice, and danger of partial
Conformity, Octavo. Price 1 s.

Dr.